

CIVILIZATION
OF
THE EASTERN IRĀNIANS.
IN ANCIENT TIMES

AN INTRODUCTION ON THE AVESTA RELIGION

BY
DR. WILHELM GEIGER

AUTHOR OF 'A MANUAL OF THE AVESTA LANGUAGE,' 'AOGEMADAĒCHA,' ETC.

Translated from the German
WITH A PREFACE, NOTES, A BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR, &c.,

BY
DARAB DASTUR PESHOTAN SANJĀNA, B.A.,

MEMBER OF THE GERMAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, SIR JAMSHEDJEE FELLOW (AVESTA AND PAHLAVI)
AND GERMAN TEACHER, SIR JAMSHEDJEE JIJIBHAI ZARTHOSHTI
MADRESSA, BOMBAY.

VOL. II.—THE OLD IRANIAN POLITY & THE AGE OF THE AVESTA.

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1886.

[All rights reserved.]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

STATE AND LAWS.

	PAGE
§ 1. Constitution	I
§ 2. War and Military Concerns	17
§ 3. Legal Rights	31

CHAPTER II.

ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONS.

§ 4. The Priesthood	45
§ 5. Warriors, Peasants, Manufacturers and Slaves ...	64
§ 6. The Mutual Relations of the Several Orders ...	72

CHAPTER III.

ON THE HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA.

General Remarks	85
§ 7. The Home of the Avesta	88
§ 8. The Age of the Avesta	III

APPENDIX.

I. GUSHTASP AND ZOROASTER ...	167
II. IRĀNIAN ART ...	228
III. THE IRĀNIAN ALPHABETS ...	273

SASANIAN INSCRIPTION OF NAQSH-i-RUSTAM by Dr.

E. W. West, Münich. (Reprinted from the "Indian Antiquary")

Opinions

Translator's Notes, pp. 31, 34, 39, 40, 46, 56, 62, 65, 72, 73, 75, 103, 125, 143, 144, 145, 147, 172, 177, 193, 194, 195, 196, 205, 216, 217, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 238, 245, 248, 271, 272.



CIVILIZATION
OF THE
EASTERN IRĀNIANS
IN
ANCIENT TIMES.

CHAPTER I.

STATE AND LAWS.*

§ I. *Constitution.*

IN all ages and countries the State has grown out of the family.¹ State and family were originally identical. All the relations, which subsist in family life between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, have their counterparts in civil society. Here the relations between the sovereign and his people, between the government and its subjects, and frequently also between freemen and slaves, are similar in kind.

The family develops itself gradually into the clan, the clan into the tribe, the tribe into the nation. But actual political life only begins when the nation has made a permanent settlement in a fixed region, and territorial associations form a new tie binding families and races to the State.

* Chapter VII. § 44, *Ostirānische Kultur.*

¹ Cf. Arnold, "German Antiquity," pp. 310 seq.; Kaufmann, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. I. p. 113.

It must be understood that the development of the nation does not proceed on the basis of races and tribes alone, but is equally influenced by territorial division. In proportion as the new influence gathers stability and vital power, the family loses its political importance and retains only that founded on private rights.

It is in this first stage of political existence that we find the Irānians of the Avesta. They are no longer herdsmen, or nomads, but settled agriculturists. Territorial distinctions, therefore, already appear, but not to such an extent that the old constitution of races and tribes is thereby disturbed and impaired.

In the Eastern Irānian State the *family* forms the fundamental unit of the political organization of the people.

The clan is made up of a number of kindred families, while the tribe is formed of a number of clans. The tribal system may have, likewise, developed itself so far in the case of the Irānians, that families and clans no longer restricted themselves to their natural members, but also admitted outsiders into their body. Clans numerically weak banded together for the purpose of securing their independence, while others perhaps divided themselves for economical reasons. However, the characteristic marks of clanship survived.

Every individual was only a member of the State in so far as he or she belonged to a particular family or clan. Individual citizens were not political units, but the family and the clan were; and the latter held a higher or lower position in the State in proportion to their rank and influence. There were no civil officers other than the elders of the clan or tribe—a system which takes little account of personal merit or efficiency.

In the Avesta State a certain tendency to division and isolation cannot but be perceived, as might perhaps be expected from the nature of the country. Soil suitable for

agricultural settlements is generally not to be found in large unbroken expanses, but in isolated tracts and parcels. A community, which occupies such a spot, forms to a certain extent a state by itself, being separated from other communities by high and almost inaccessible mountain-ranges and by dreary deserts.

In fact, the more tenaciously the Eastern Irānian clings to the narrow circle of his blood-relations, the less developed is his sympathy with the State and its interests. Religion alone forms a tie sufficiently strong to bind one community to another. It plays a far more important part than national cohesion.

It is, indeed, characteristic that the Avesta language does not even contain a word descriptive of the people as a political body. Even the old Indian word *jana*¹ in the passages where it appears in contradistinction to the term "sovereign" or "king," approaches this meaning far more nearly than any word in the Avesta.

The Eastern Irānian village was an aggregation of families. It consisted of several farm-houses, each of which was inhabited by a family. Possibly also the families most closely related formed within the village a compact group or a special quarter,² as is the case at the present day amongst the Kishlāks of the Badakhshāni.

¹ Comp. Zimmer, *AiL*. pp. 158-159.

² A similar circumstance is in my opinion indicated by *qaetu* which occurs together with *verezēna* (another form is *verezāna*) and *airyaman* in Ys. XXXIII. 3 and 4, XLIX. 7. The traditional translation of that word is the Phlv. *Khvēshīh* = Mod. Pers. *Khēshī*, "relation, consanguinity." Compare also *qaēthvō-datha*, "marriage of relations." *Verezēna* corresponds strikingly with the Skr. *vrjāna*, "village, village-community" (just as *grāma*). However, the identity of these two words is contested by many. Skr. *vrjāna* means originally "enclosure," then "hurdle, enclosed village." This fundamental meaning cannot but be supposed to be involved in the Ir. *verezēna*, since *varez* always means only

At all events the smallest divisions of the State were looked upon as being at once local and political. They had, therefore, a real and tangible importance in connection with the daily life of the people. The *house* or farm was identical with the *family*, the *village* with the *clan*. According to traditional accounts fifteen families were sufficient to form a clan or village-community; but I suspect that this minimum existed in theory rather than in practice.

The *clans* or *Vis* traced their descent from a common ancestor. The clan as such was called by his name; but in the course of a generation the same name was also again applied to single individuals.

"to work." I may here refer to the Mod. Pers. *barzīgar*, "husbandman," and *barzan*, "*vicus, urbis, mansion.*" *Verezēna* then came to denote the village as an association of colonists that follow agriculture. The word approaches its original signification "work, care," in *āthrō-verezēnē*, "care (tending), cult of the fire," (Ys. XXXVI. 1); the same idea is indeed expressed in *ashahyā-verezēnē*, (Ys. XXXV. 8). More certainly does the word *varezāna* designate the village in the passage where it is used with the word *maēthana*, "farm-house," (Yt. X. 80; Comp. also Yt. X. 116), just as in the phrase *ashā · frādh · verezēnā-* (Ys. XXXIV. 14), which is the same as the *ashā · frādh · gaethāo*. —A wider confederation, probably the union of neighbouring village-communities into a common league, offensive and defensive, is to be understood by *airyaman*. This meaning of the word is clear when it occurs along with *hakheman*, "friendship."

The expressions *qaētu*, *verezēna* and *airyaman*, evidently refer to the moral relation of the individual families to each other. The proper technical names for the constitution of the tribe are: 1, *Nmāna*, "house, family"; 2, *Vis*, "village, clan, race"; 3, *Zantu*, "tribe"; 4, *Daihu* or *Dagyu*, "country." For the two first *vide* vol. I. pp. 233-234 and 237-238. *Zantu* is derived from the root *zan*, "to generate, to bring forth"; Skr. *Jantu*, "descendant, race, tribe." The political organization is not altogether identical with that of the Vedic Arians. Amongst the latter the different classifications are called *Jana*, *Vic*, *Grāma* or *Vrjana*, which, according to Zimmer (*AiL.* pp. 158 *seq.*), respectively denote "tribe (single nation), country and village."

One of the most renowned races in the Avesta is the Āthwyanian which evidently derives its origin from the half-legendary hero *Athwya*. From it the hero Thraitāna, the conqueror of Azhi Dahāka, derives his descent.¹ I would mention also the race of the Nautarids, to which Kavi Vishtāspa belongs. His wife, Hutausa, is also included in it, wives being admitted into the clans of their husbands.² Finally, from the race of the Hvōvids descends Jāmāspa, one of the first men who declared for the religion of Zarathushtra. . . .

The tribe, called *Zantu*, was evidently an almost abstract conception. It is not mentioned by itself in the Avesta, but only as included in the system of the Zoroastrian constitution.

The last one is composed of individual families. Hence we see that the old Arian people were, indeed, likewise organized according to consanguinity and race, primarily into the separate nations, of Irānians and Indians, and hence was developed an extremely legal and permanent political organization.—*Danhu* corresponds literally to the Vedic *dasyu*, which designates the non-Arian aborigines of the Panjāb. The relation of both these terms and their meanings is as follows: The primitive Arian word denoted, as does also its cognate *dāsa*, hostile tribes. The Indian *dasyu* retained that signification, and served subsequently as a name for the enemies of the gods or demons. But the Irānians understood by the term *Danhu*, the land rescued from enemies, or country in general; even the Mod. Pers. *dih*, which is purely topographical, signifies a village. The Latin *provincia* may be conveniently suggested for comparison. We have a striking compound word in *danhu-pāperetāna*, “battle of the (for the?) countries,” which most vividly reminds us of the Skr. *dasyu-hatya*. Lassen, *I. A.* vol. I. pp. 633 seq.; Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 544; vol. II. p. 241; Zimmer, *AiL*. pp. 109 seq.

¹ “Unto her, the Anāhita, offered * the offspring of the Athwyanian race, * the offspring of the mighty race, Thraitāna,” Yt. V. 33; IX. 13; XV. 23; XVII. 33; comp. Ys. IX. 7.

² Yt. V. 98, *vide* vol. I. p. 176. Yt. XV. 35:—“Unto him, the Rāman, implored Hutausa, who was rich in brothers, and of the race of the Nautarids.”

We cannot, moreover, represent by the tribe in the old Irānian State a large and independent portion of the people, following its own course of development. The word *Zantu* only denoted a certain number of families and clans which were more closely united amongst themselves than with others, which probably derived their descent from the same ancestor, and which had, I believe, emigrated together before they settled in the country.

Local circumstances exercised far greater influence than the more theoretical union of the tribe. At all events, with the foundation of permanent settlements, one race was easily divided from another, and the nation became a confederacy of distinct races. The theory as such was retained, but in reality the situation of the different village-communities played a far more important part in practical life. The closer pursuit of agriculture in many districts, the distribution of water over the fields, the construction of canals and trenches for irrigation, as well as the right of pasture also necessitated an adjustment of the relations between the individual communities.

Hence, instead of the 'tribe,' or, as the phrase also occurs, of the 'race and tribe,' the purely local idea of the 'settlement' or of the 'district' appears already in the Gāthās. By this is evidently meant the territory with all its settlements occupied by one or more races.

"Accordingly I ask Thee, how the bounteous one, who
desires the mastery over an estate,

Or over a district, or over a country, in order to
propagate piety,

As a man devoted to Thee, O Mazda Ahura: how
he must be and how he must act?"

"None of you shall listen to the words and precepts
of the vicious;

For he will bring unto his house, and unto his village,
unto his district and unto his country, grief and death."

"(Nay), beat them down with the weapon!"¹

Finally, the *country* or *Daqyu* appears to be of geographical rather than of political significance. The term "countries" stands for land in general: "Thou art the worst and the best at the same time, O Mithra, for men! Thou commandest over peace and discord, O Mithra, in the countries!"²

The land of the Avesta people was divided into several countries, for which reason the Arian countries are always spoken of in the plural. Mention is also made of the countries belonging to the non-Arians and to the Tūrānians. This is quite consistent, as the "country" meant originally the districts snatched from the enemy, and we are free to conclude hence that the tribes of foreign race had the same system of clanship as the Arians.

The individual village-communities, as well as the countries themselves, seem to have been independent of each other, and, as a rule, to have followed their own line of policy. Occasionally, however, they also formed themselves into a larger confederation, particularly, I believe, when they were required to beat off some common external enemy.³

A tribal system, similar to that which the Eastern Irānians possessed, according to the description of the Avesta, existed also in Western Irān. This we may infer from the statements of Herodotus and of the old Persian cuneiform inscriptions.

The Medes were divided into six, the Persians into ten subdivisions or tribes. Each tribe contained in itself

¹ Ys. XXXI. 16, (*nmāna, shōithra, daqyu*) and 18 (*nmāna, vis, shōithra, daqyū*). For the second passage comp. vol. I. p. 14.

² Yt. X. 29.

³ Thus we must, I believe, explain *airyaman* (*vide supra*, p. 4, note), and *dañhusasti* (Ys. LII. 5 and Yt. X. 87). The latter name represents a more comprehensive union in the list, after house, village, tribe and country.

several clans, each clan a number of distinct families. Such a clan amongst the Persians was that of the Achämenids, from which descended the Great Kings, who consequently may have been originally, also, the elders of clans and tribes.¹

The finer distinction of the Avesta between a tribe and a country, a *Zantu* and a *Daqyu*, besides being of no practical value, appears even to have been unknown in Western Irān. Here they understood by the "tribe" evidently a comprehensive union, which, as was frequently the case with the Germans, coincided with the country; for the tribe was the genealogical, the country the geographical, designation for the same division of the State.

How much the culture of a nation is influenced by the natural features of its territory is clearly observed in the old Irānian State as composed of races. To this potent factor we may ascribe the preservation of the same constitution up to the present time amongst the tribes of Irān, which have remained untouched by civilization, in the midst of the Afghāns, Lūres and Kurds.

The first of the tribes named above is the most important for us, since it partly dwells in the territory of the Avesta people.

Among the Afghāns the family has the same political importance that it had in ancient days.² It forms the basis of the entire national organization of the people; but the State is rather more developed in its details.

¹ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. II. pp. 237-238. *Vide* Herodotus, I. 101, 125. The technical terms used in the Avesta, in the Cuneiform Inscriptions and in Herodotus, are the following :—

Avesta.	Cuneiform Inscriptions.	Herodotus.
1. <i>dan̄hu</i> }		
2. <i>zantu</i> }	<i>daqyush</i>	<i>γένος.</i>
3. <i>vīs</i>	<i>v'ith</i>	<i>φρήτρη.</i>
4. <i>nmāna</i>	<i>māniya</i>

With what follows compare Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. I. pp. 310 seq.

We cannot simply distinguish, as in the case of the Avesta people, three concentric circles which have the family as the central point, but generally four or even five, so that our terms—"country," "tribe," and "race"—are no longer sufficient.

The Afghān *Khail* or "clan" appears chiefly to correspond to the *Vis* or *clan* of the Avesta people. But the *Khails* are no doubt proportionally more considerable. They spread themselves as a rule over several villages, and often comprehend a very considerable number of families.

Several clans form again a larger group. This is particularly the case with the Bannu Afghāns, whose extensive alliances concluded for mutual defence, are called *Gundi*.¹ With the latter I might compare the *Zantu* or *tribe* of the Avesta.

The great leading tribes of the Afghāns, such as the Dūrānī, Ghilzai, Khaiberī, Yūsufzāi, may be regarded as corresponding in some measure to the *Dagyus* or *countries*, a supposition which is warranted chiefly by the fact that they are really divided from each other according to territory.

The country of the Dūrānī is bounded on the North by that of the Aimāk and Hezār, towards the West and South-West it touches the desert, in the South it reaches the district of Shōrāwak and the Khoja-Amrān mountains. Northward of the Dūrānī dwell the Ghilzai on the Upper Arghandāb and Tarnak, and along the banks of the river Lāgar as far as the Panjir.

The Khaiberī occupy the eastern spurs of the Sefīd-Kōh. The Yūsufzai inhabit the plains of Peshāwur as well as the valleys of the rivers running from the North into the Kābul-rūd.

¹ Compare Gerland in Thorburn, *Globus*, XXXI. 1877, p. 315.

In order briefly to describe the Afghān constitution as it holds among the Dūrānīs and to illustrate ancient institutions by modern practice, we may mention that they are subdivided into two principal divisions and nine tribes. Each tribe is composed of a number of races or clans and families.

The Popalzai form a tribe of the Dūrānīs, the Saddozai a clan of the Popalzai. From a family of the Saddozai was descended the founder of the Afghān power.

The Bannu Afghāns are also divided into numerous *Khails* or clans. Each clan consists of several village-communities, each village-community again of several families.

Like the political organization of the Avesta people, their government is also patriarchal.

The *master of the house* is the head of each house or of each individual family; the *master of the clan or village* superintends the clan or the village, and is perhaps selected from amongst the *patres-familias*. But it is far more probable that the headman of the leading oldest family of the race held that dignity *ipso facto*.

The *master of the tribe* is the chief of the *Zantu* or "tribe." Lastly, the *prince or sovereign of the country* is the head of the country. They also possibly owed their dignity to election; or perhaps enjoyed it in consequence of the position in the tribe occupied by their clans and their families.¹

All authority in the Avesta State was evidently analogous to the dignity and legal power possessed by the

¹ Their names in the Avesta dialect are:—*nmānō-paiti*, "master of the house" (also *nmānya*); *vīs-paiti*, "master of the village or clan" (also *vīsyā*); *zañtu-paiti*, "master of the tribe" (also *zañtuma*); *dañhu-paiti*, "master of the country" (also *daqyuma*). The same chiefs are again and again mentioned; as in Yt. X. 83-84: "Him, Mithra, does the master of the country implore with uplifted hands for help, him the master of the tribe, him the master of the village, him the master of the house." Comp. Yt. X. 17, 18; Vsp. III. 2; Vd. VII. 41, 42; Ys. IX. 27, &c.

pater-familias in his household. It is a remarkable fact that the Shirānī, an Afghān tribe inhabiting the Suleimān mountains, designate their chief, who is always the head of the oldest family,¹ by the title of *Nika*, "little grandfather."

We will not err if we assume that the greatest influence was directly exercised by the master of the house and the elder of the clan or village. A similar state of things still exists amongst those tribes of modern Irān, which have preserved their ancient constitution. Amongst them each family, each clan and each tribe has, as in the case of the Avesta people, its own head—a condition of things which savours strongly of republicanism. The chiefs of the different tribes possess as a rule more power and influence than the king.²

For success in his more important enterprises the Amir of Afghānistān depends entirely upon the greater or less good-will of the tributary princes, who are nominally subordinate to him. The individual tribes are altogether independent. Even the most powerful princes are content when the tribes only bind themselves to pay an insignificant tribute, and to take the field on their behalf in case of war.

The Afghāns of Bannu have generally no common Khān. Each village-population selects its own *Malik*, who collects certain taxes, out of which, however, the public expenses are to be defrayed. The *Khails*, too, select their own *Malik*, who is distinguished by his power or noble birth. The *Gundis* also have their own leader, whilst no higher central authority is known.³

¹ See *Globus*, vol. XXXI. 1877, p. 333. Cf. also Elphinstone, "Kabul," vol. II. pp. 24 seq., on the Afghān clans and their government.

² Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. II. p. 240.

³ *Globus*, vol. XXXI. 1877, p. 317.

The State management which obtains among the Kafirs, appears to be the most primitive of all. Here the entire government consists in a sort of patriarchal control exercised by the heads of certain families. However, the powers of such elders are very limited.¹

We may safely believe that the sovereigns of "countries" lived in a style of extreme simplicity. The type of such patriarchal rulers is *Yima*, "the rich in flocks." We may infer from the epithet thus applied to him, that this prince was, like his subjects, devoted to agriculture and cattle-breeding, and was distinguished from them only by his larger fields and flocks.

The country-princes principally display their activity in war. They are also, therefore, called "the armed rulers."²

"The country-princes pray unto him (Mithra), when they draw themselves up in line of battle against the terrible armies, against those gathered thus together for fighting in the war of the country."³

Vadhaghna and *Arvasāra*, the opponents of *Kavi Husrava*,⁴ are styled "country-princes." The *Yazatas* also receive this title of honour, especially Mithra, who is even called the "provincial lord of all the countries," because he rules as the *Sun-Yazata* from heaven over the entire world.⁵

Another appellation for the master of a country is *Sāstar*, "the ruler."⁶ The *Sāstar* also displays his power in the field:

¹ "Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society," vol. II. 1880, p. 251.

² *Thwām* . *Yazūoñtē* . *aurvāoñghō* . *ahurāoñghō* . *dāñhu-patāyō*.
Yt. V. 85.

³ Yt. X. 8.

⁴ Vol. XIX. 6; Yt. XV. 31.

⁵ Yt. X. 78.—*Mithrem* . *vispanām* . *daqyunām* . *dāñhu-paitīm*.
Yt. X. 145. Comp. Ys. I. 11.

⁶ *Sāstare* from the root *sāoñgh* = Skr. *cas*, "to command."

"Mithra surveys the whole Arian-land, the most blissful,
where armed rulers command excellent troops."¹

The identity of the Sāstars with the country-princes is proved by their title of all-commanding rulers of the country.² If such a one duly adores the Fravashis, who manifest their aid chiefly in battle, he will attain special power.³ They are principally the *manes* who protect the ruler in every difficulty.

"When hostile antagonists pursue the all-commanding ruler of the country; and when he (*the latter*) implores the bold *fravashis* of the pious; then they come to his protection."⁴

Such is the position which the Sāstar holds in the Yashts. Here he is clearly the country-prince so far as he is the commander-in-chief of the army.

An entirely different picture is more strikingly exhibited in the Yasna and the Vendidād. In these books the Sāstar is considered as a wicked being, an inimical tyrant full of death and destruction.

"Against the body of the vicious man, of the malicious *sāstar*, throw thy weapon, O golden Hauma!
to favour the threatened pious people."⁵

So early as in the Gāthās is this antipathy to the Sāstars observed,⁶ and we might almost believe that we here

¹ Yt. X. 13-14.

² *Sāsta · dāñhēush · hāmō-khshaihrō*.

³ "If (*anybody*) makes good offerings * unto the *fravashis* of the pious,* he will become an all-commanding ruler of the country,* the most powerful prince among mankind," Yt. XIII. 18.

⁴ Yt. XIII. 69-70. *Avi-spashīō*, "threatened by an ambush": from *avi-spas*, literally "to glance at somebody."

⁵ Ys. IX. 31. Comp. *Yo · mushyō · drvāo · sāsta*, Vd. XXI. 1; IV. 49; Ys. LXV 8.—*Sāstrahēcha, pouru-mahrkahē*, Ys. LXI. 1—LXVIII. 8.

⁶ *Naedhā · daqyēush · yōi · sāstārō · dregvañtō*, occur in difficult passage, Ys. XLVI. 1.

touch upon the traces of a conflict between the priesthood and the political power. This antique "*Kulturkampf*," however, must have gradually died out. In the Yashts, composed in later times and especially for the use of the laity, this antagonism seems to have entirely disappeared.

The title *Khshathra*, "sovereign," is also very ancient, and is found even in the sacred Gāthās. It is before the Khshathras that Zarathushtra and his immediate adherents and followers proclaim the new religion. Whether they will decide in its favour is the most striking and important question:

"Therefore I ask Thee, give me truly answer,
O Ahura:

How shall I maintain my doctrine purer,
Which is to be proclaimed before the bounteous
sovereign

As the true princedom and the right doctrine by
Thy adherent, O Mazda,
Who dwells amongst the settlers piously and good-
mindedly?"¹

The Khshathras are not always inclined to embrace the Mazda-religion. They adhere sometimes to false priests, the *Kavis* and *Karapans*, instead of listening to the precepts of the Zoroastrian sages. As a punishment for their stubbornness they are threatened with eternal damnation.²

Good and bad princes are sharply distinguished:—

"Good princes shall rule over us, but no wicked
princes.

With deeds of good wisdom, O Ārmatī!"³

¹ Ys. XLIV. 9. Cf. vol. I. p. 231. Also compare Vsp. I. 9: "I lay out the offering and make it known to the lord of the country, who is devoted to Ahura" (*Ahurōish · dagyumahē*.)

² Ys. XLVI. 11; XLIX. 11: comp. vol. I. pp. 99-101.

³ Ys. XLVIII. 5. The emendation of the first line: *Hu-khshathrā · nē · mā · dushkhshathrā · khshayañtū*, was first suggested by Roth. (Cf. C. de Harlez, *Av. tr.* II. p. 147, note).

"When will, O Mazda! the men of wisdom step forth?

When will they drive away the filth of intoxication;
Of which vice the false priests are proud,
And of which the wicked rulers of countries boast?"¹

Grēhma appears to have been such a prince, hostile to the Zoroastrian religion.² On the other hand, the princes like Vishtāspa and Jāmāspa are extolled as the first adherents of Zarathushtra.³

The country-princes were independent of each other. But it also happened occasionally that a powerful poten-tate acquired supremacy over several or all the Arian countries. This is particularly mentioned of Kavi Husrava, the Kai Khosrav of the Shāhnāme, who is likewise, therefore, called in the Avesta the hero who united the Arian countries into an empire.⁴

In like manner Haushyangha, Yima and Kavi Usan address the following prayer to Ardvī-sūra: "Grant, O most blissful Anāhita, that I may become the supreme ruler over all the countries of demons and men!"⁵

The dominion of village-elders and of country-princes was not absolute.

Among the Afghāns, the heads of families as well as the *Maliks* of village-communities and of clans, meet together in an assembly, which has the right to impose penalties and to adjust differences, and which thus curbs the power of the head *Malik*.

¹ Ys. XLVIII. 10. *Dushkhshathrā · daqyunām*. strikingly re-minds us of *sāsta · dāñheush*.

² Ys. XXXII. 12-14.

³ Ys. LI. 16; XLIX. 9 (cf. also Ys. XLVI. 14 seq.; LIII. 2.)

⁴ *Arshā · airyānām · daqunām · khshathrāi · hañkeremō*, Yt. V. 49; IX. 21; XV. 32.

⁵ *Yatha · bavāni · upemem · khshathrem · vīspanām · daqyunām · daēvanām · mashyānāmcha*, apparently meaning "the non-Arians and the Arians," Yt. V. 22, 26, 46.

Popular assemblies are also known amongst the Lures and even amongst the wildest tribes of the Kurds.¹ They are evidently very old institutions, and at the same time an organic element in the constitution of the tribe.

Of Yima it is related in the Avesta that he convoked an assembly of the best among men.² This assembly was also graced by the presence of Ahura Mazda and the good genii. Ahura Mazda announced unto Yima the impending deluge and gave him the necessary counsel, how to escape from that danger with his people.

Here we have clearly before us the description of an old country-prince, and how he holds solemn council with the nobles of his tribe regarding some important event.

The assemblies were, it seems, opened with prayer, in fact, with the *Ahuna-varya* formula,³ whereby the help of the Divine Spirit was invoked and the pernicious influence of evil was averted.

A man, whose word is of weight in council, is highly estimated by the people:—

“Through the power and glory of the *fravashis* an able man rises in the assembly, a counsellor of convincing speech, who possesses the longed-for wisdom, who will protect his countryman seeking his help, anticipating his request !”⁴

For this reason one prays also to the Fravashis:—“In my house may there be herds of cattle and troops of men, swift horses, strong chariots, and an able adviser.” “Able

¹ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. II. p. 240. Cf. also *Globus*, XXXI. 1877, p. 332.

² *Hañjamanem · frabarata · yō · Yimō · khshaētō · hvāthwō*, Vd. II. 21. Also *vyākhna* is an expression used for the “assemblage of the people,” from root *vyach*.

³ Yt. XI. 3-4.

⁴ Yt. XIII. 16. I believe, we should read the third verse thus:—
vyākhmō · hugushayat · ukhdhō.

in council" is likewise an honourable characteristic of posterity. Mithra, the all-seeing *sun-yazata*, too, enjoys the same title, which is evidently regarded by the Irānians generally as expressing the ideal of manly capacity.¹

§ 2. *War and Military Concerns.*

The peace of the Avesta nation was chiefly endangered by the plundering inroads of the northern barbarians.² Indeed, no effectual military precautions could be taken against such foes,³ save to be always on the watch and to parry attacks as skilfully as possible. However, regular campaigns were not unknown. The Arians undertook wars against the enemies of their tribes, partly, it appears, for the sake of conquest, and partly by way of retaliation for pillaging incursions.⁴

Internal dissensions were also, I believe, frequent amongst the Arians themselves, for social and religious differences were common. It was, therefore, a matter of honour for every man to be always brave and warlike.⁵

In the field every head of a family was accompanied by his *followers*, who, I am inclined to believe, chiefly consisted of grown-up sons; however, the able-bodied servants must also have accompanied their master in war; and, the larger the number of his followers, the more important naturally was his position in the camp. "Troops of heroes" are, therefore, in addition to cattle and fields, one of the principal objects of desire to the Irānian.

¹ Yt. XIII. 52; Ys. LXII. 5; Yt. X. 65.

² *Akhshti*, "peace"; *anākhshti*, "discord."

³ "Enemy," *dushmainyu*, *tbishvat*, *hameretha*, Yt. X. 11; *haretha*, Yt. X. 34; *verethra* just as Skr. *vrīra*, Ys. XLIV. 16.

⁴ Yt. X. 8; cf. vol. I. p. 27.

⁵ *Yuidhishta*, *Kāhin*.

" Give strength and victory, give herds that create prosperity, give a troop of heroes, able and eloquent, victorious and unconquered, who may overpower the opponents, who may subdue the enemies, who may bless the people and protect their race ! " ¹

The organization of the army was of course based on no other principle than the constitution of the State during peace. The family constituted the military as it did the political unit. The warriors ranged themselves family by family and clan by clan, the ties of relationship being thus regarded as the most stable bond of union in the moment of danger.²

Armies were modelled after the same pattern by the Indians, with whom the expression "village-community" meant exactly a troop of warriors.³ The same was also the case amongst the old Germans:—

" The armed nation was at the same time the army, for army and nation were synonymous, and only the invalids, children, women and old men were excluded from military service. In the most ancient times the case was similar with every nation, and it was so much the more believed to be indispensable by the Germans, as their tribes had to be necessarily organized in a warlike manner when on their migrations. Also there were wandering armies which had to be ready every moment for defence."

" The sub-divisions of the people into countries, hundreds, and communities, therefore, constitute the sections of the army; or, as we can say perhaps more correctly, the divisions of the nation owed their origin

¹ Nyaj. III. 10. Cf. *viryām-iṣṭīm*, *viryām-vāthwām*, &c., Yt. VIII. 15; XIII. 52; and the compound form *pasu-vira*, Ys. XLV. 9, LVIII. 6.

² Yt. XIII. 67 may be cited as a proof (*vide* vol. I. pp. 114-115).

³ Zimmer, *AiL*. pp. 160-161. In the Avesta the army is called *ura*=Skr. *vrā*. The latter particularly designates a subdivision of the *vic*.

inversely to its military organization. Here the relationship and union of races were of course taken into consideration as much as possible, for, as we learn from Tacitus, the nearest relatives among the old Germans stood together also in battle.”¹

The task of leading the army devolved on the country-prince. He had to take care that the army was properly arrayed in ranks, since the Irānians did not fight, like barbarians, in irregular masses, but already to a certain extent in drilled battalions.²

The use of banners or military ensigns, too, points to a certain tactical order in the field. It is intended, I believe, to indicate the military skill and capacity of the inhabitants of *Bākhdi*, when that city receives in the Avesta the epithet “with highly-raised banners.”³ It is also said of the Fravashis, who are active in battle, that they bear military ensigns.

Before the battle rages the divine spirits are invoked for assistance. “The country-princes pray unto Mithra, when they go to battle.”⁴ In fact, they owe their victory to the strength and aid of the celestial ones.

“Therefore I ask Thee, give me truly answer, O Ahura:

¹ Arnold, “German Antiquity” (3) pp. 286-287; cf. Kaufmann, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. I. p. 121. Tacitus, *Germ.* 7: “Quod praecipuum fortitudinis incitamentum est, non casus neque fortuita congregatio turmam aut cuncum facit, sed familiæ et propinquitates.”

² Cf. supra pp. 12-13; Yt. X. 14; *Sāstārō · aurva . . . urāo · rāzayeqīti* (Skr. *rāj*, “to rule, to command”). The “battle” is *hamarana* (Yt. XIII. 31)=Skr. *samaranya*; or *peshana* (*dañhu-pāperetāna*)=Skr. *pr̥tanā*. The “line of battle” is *areza* (Yt. X. 8 and 36, XIII. 33) or *rasman* (Yt. V. 68, X. 47); Comp. *rasmanō · hāmstāiti*, “the drawing up of the army in files,” Yt. XIII. 39. “Army” = *spādha*, Mod. Pers. *sipāh*.

³ *Drafsha*, “banner”; *eredhzeō-drafsha*, Vd. I. 7.

⁴ Yt. X. 8.

Whether Thou commandest over it in holiness,
 When the two armies silently dash together,
 According to those doctrines, which Thou, Mazda,
 wouldest have us adhere to :
 How and to which of the two Thou wilt grant the
 victory ? ”¹

A war-song, the author of which imagines himself to be on the eve of a bloody battle, is preserved in the Avesta :

“ May the two exalted friends
 Come to our help,
 When the swords raise their din (*i. e. clash*) loudly,
 When the horses’ nostrils snort,
 When the daggers gleam, and the strings
 Send forth sharp arrows :
 Then shall the sons of God’s contemners
 Be hurled headlong ! ”²

The swaying of the battle from one side to the other is compared to the conflux of mighty waters, especially to that of the Voru-kasha. “ There quiver all the flanks, there shakes the entire middle, when flows into it, when streams into it the Ardvi-sūra Anāhita.”³

Now is the time for the *Yazatas* to render support and vigorous help. It is principally the Fravashis and Mithra, who now display their might.⁴

¹ Ys. XLIV. 15.

² Yt. X. 113. By the “ two friends ” (Av. *Mithra*) are implied Ahura and Mithra. “ God’s contemners ” is a free rendering. The text has *gouru-zaothranām*, “ of those who bring odious offerings.” The expression might be changed into *gouru-zaothra*, in order to suit the metre, so that *hunavō* may perhaps be translated “the *Hunus*.”

³ Yt. V. 4. The metaphor is taken from the waving of the line of battle, *karana* is the flank, the wing; *maidhya*, the middle, the centre. Cf. Yt. X. 36, XIII. 39.

⁴ Yt. XIII. 17, 31, 37-38, 66-67. *Vide* vol. I. pp. 114-115.

"Mithra opens the war, he joins in the combat; standing in the fight he shatters the lines arrayed for battle. There stagger all the flanks of the army led to the fight; he (Mithra) puts to flight the whole centre of the blood-stained army of the enemy."¹

Respecting their *equipment in war* it may be mentioned that offensive weapons were more in use than defensive armour. However, the latter was not quite unknown.

The Tūrānian prince, Frangrasyan, wears a coat-of-mail made of brass. The Fravashis are *metaphorically* conceived as clad in brazen armour, apparently after the manner of heavy-armed warriors on earth. Mithra as the *Yazata of light* is clad in a gold coat-of-mail.²

We do not err if we assume that brazen armour was used especially by those who fought on chariots. In their exposed position they stood more in need of protection than other combatants. Only people of rank, who belonged to the military nobility, fought from chariots. The rest of the nation fought probably on foot around them. Cavalry, too, were even known to a certain extent.³

The most valuable property of the "chariot-warriors" consisted naturally in their steeds, for whose strength and vigour they prayed.⁴ "Famous through chariots" is a term of praise bestowed upon the horse.⁵ The princes are called "possessors of snorting steeds and of rumbling

¹ Yt. X. 36 (*cf.* X. 39). The same is said of *Verthragna*, Yt. XIV. 62, and of *Sraoratha*, Ys. LVII. 12.

² Ys. XI. 7 speaks of Frangrasyan as *ayañhahō-pairish-hwakhta*; Yt. XIII. 45 represents the *fravashis* to be *ayō-verethra* (this epithet is proved to be a later addition for the sake of restoring the original metre); Yt. X. 112 says of Mithra that he was *zaranyō-vārethman*; also *vāreman*, (Yt. V. 130) = Skr. *varman*, meaning perhaps a "coat-of-mail." Cf., however, vol. I. p. 239, note 1.

³ Comp. vol. I. p. 177.

⁴ Comp. vol. I. p. 176.

⁵ *Sraoratha*, Yt. X. 30; formed like *sraotanu*.

chariots."¹ The wheel of the chariot seems to have been regarded among the Irānians, as is known to have been the case among the Indians, as the symbol of world-conquering power. At least it is said of Zarathushtra that he first of all made the wheel roll over the demons and *wicked* sons of men, that his empire embraced Arians and non-Arians.²

All this indicates that the chariot-warriors were a distinct section of the army. During battle they played a part similar to that of the Homeric heroes and the old Persian champions in the descriptions of Firdausi. They could rarely, however, have taken part in a general *mélée*; it is more likely that before the opposing armies joined battle, the chariot-warriors on both sides challenged one another to single combat; or, perhaps in the midst of the fray, they looked for opponents of equal rank, whom they could match in courage and military skill.

Each chariot combatant was accompanied by a charioteer. To the latter was entrusted a task scarcely less honourable or important than that of the former. Skilful management of the chariot was not less essential to success than the skill and valour of the warrior himself.

The charioteer in old Irān was for that reason not the servant but the devoted friend and companion of the combatant,³ as was the case among the Indians of the Vedic and the Achāians of the Homeric periods.

¹ *Fraothat-aspa* and *qanat-chakhra*, Yt. V. 130.

² *Chakhrem·urvaesayata*, Yt. XIII. 89. The phrase at once reminds us of Skr. *chakram·varī* (Grassmann, *Wtb. sub voce*) and *chakravartin*, “one who causes his chariot-wheels to roll freely over all countries; the Ruler of the Universe” (*B. R. sub voce*). However, *vrī* and *urvis* cannot possibly be identified in sound.

³ Yt. V. 131: “I pray to thee for the two-armed ones, O Anāhita, for one two-legged and for one four-legged: for the two-legged, who might swiftly approach the chariot and be forward in assailing it in battle; but for the four-legged who might

According to the Rig-veda, the princess Mudgalāñi drives in battle the team of her husband Mudgala.¹ In the Iliad, Stenelos, son of Capaneus, is the charioteer of Diomedes. Æneas himself holds the reins for Pandaros, as the latter strives to wound the raging Diomedes. On a *single* chariot stand the two sons of Priam, the bastard Antiphus and the legitimate son Isus, the former as charioteer, the latter as combatant. Similarly, the two sons of Antimachus, Pisander and Hippolochus. Cebriones, a natural son of Priam, is Hector's charioteer. As Hector alights from his chariot in order to storm the wall, Cebriones, too, places himself in the ranks of the combatants. Nor is the chariot entrusted to an inferior. Patroclus is called the charioteer of Achilles, and Cöranos, the friend and charioteer of Meriones.²

The Vendidād describes in one passage the equipment of the chariot-warrior. In this list there are also enumerated the several kinds of defensive armour, the coat-of-mail, gorget, beaver, helmet, belt, and cuisses.³

The *coat-of-mail* protects the breast from cuts and thrusts. We cannot be positive as to the pattern. It

crush both the wings of the enemy's army, that fight in the broad front, in his flight to the left and to the right, to the right and to the left." It is plainly the wish of a chariot-warrior for a swift charioteer, and for a strong team of horses. We do not avail ourselves of the double meaning of the expression *Ava · aurvanta*. *Aurvata* evidently means just the same as Vedic *Arvat*, the lancer as well as the horse.

¹ Rv. 10. 102. 2. Comp. also Zimmer, *AiZ.* p. 269.

² Iliad, Bk. III. ll. 367, 403 seq.; Bk. V. ll. 107 seq., ll. 239 seq., ll. 217 seq.; Bk. XI. ll. 101 seq., ll. 122 seq., ll. 521 seq.; Bk. XVI. ll. 726 seq.; Bk. XIII. ll. 91-92; Bk. XVII. ll. 426, 616 seq.

³ *Zrādha*, *kuri*, *paiti-dāna*, *sārvāra* (from *sāra*, "head," and *vāra* from rt. *var*, "to protect"), *kamara* (= Mod. Pers. *kamar*), *rūna-pāna* (literally "the thigh-protecting"). See Vd. XIV. 9.

may have consisted either of metallic scales or rings of brass.¹

Respecting the *helmet*, we do not know whether it was made of leather or of metal. At all events metal ones were not unknown. Helmets of brass were worn by the Fravashis as well as by Vayu, the *wind-yazata*, and by Mithra. It is *allegorically* said that Vayu wore a golden, Mithra a silver, helmet.²

The *gorget* probably connected the cuirass with the helmet. The *beaver* covered, as a sort of visor, the lower part of the face; the *cusses* the thigh. The *belt* served, I believe, as among the Achäians, not merely to support the sword but also at the same time to protect the body.

Regarding the use of the *shield* we learn very little from the Avesta. Apparently it was only seldom used. At all events the *yazata* Ashi and the Fravashis are represented as shield-bearers,³

We have abundant allusions to offensive weapons.

The most ancient was the *club*.⁴ Every knotted piece of wood could serve as such. Plates or knobs of metal were used to increase its tremendous weight. Clubs are the special weapon of the good spirits, who are armed for fighting in the manner known to the earliest antiquity.

"When the evil-minded malefactor hastens hither with speedy steps, then Mithra, the lord over

¹ This is confirmed by the Mod. Pers. word *sirah*, which especially denotes a coat-of-mail, as well as by the derivation of *zrādha* from rt. *zrād* = Skr. *hrād*, "to clatter." In Sanskrit *hrādin* means "the warrior," also "the thunderbolt of Indra," *hrāda*, "the noise or clanging."

² *Ayō-khaodha*, Yt. XIII. 45; *Zaranyō-khaodha*, Yt. XV. 57; comp. vol. I. p. 213.

³ *Spāra-dāshta*, Yt. XIII. 35; XIX. 54 (Mod. Pers. *sipar*, "scutum").

⁴ The club already occurs in the Gāthās as *vadare* (Skr. *vadhar*), Ys. XXXII, 10. Also the weapon with which Hauma dashes down the evil-doer is called *vadhare* (Ys. IX. 30 seq.).

wide fields, yokes his bright chariot; and Srausha and Ashi, the bold, and Naryōsangha, the miraculously powerful, swing vigorously their dangerous clubs.”¹

Clubs were used both for throwing and for striking. The missile club was particularly the weapon of Srausha.² It was fastened to the girdle,³ as was also the custom of the most ancient warriors of the North.⁴

The missile clubs were often angular, and therefore proved very effective. They were also mounted with studs and tipped with brass. Perhaps they were cast in solid metal. At least so it is said of the club of Mithra, which, of course with the usual exaggeration as to numbers, is described by the Avesta in the following manner:

“He holds fast with the hand his club, the hundred-knobbed, the hundred-edged, the down-crashing one, annihilating men, which is cast in light-coloured brass, strong, gold-coloured (brass); the most powerful of all weapons, the most victorious of all weapons.”⁵

The club especially employed for striking was also shod with brass.⁶ It is referred to as the weapon of Mithra,

¹ Yt. X. 52. Here the club is denoted by *vādha*, akin to *vadhare*, from rt. *vādh*, “to strike, to kill.”

² *Vazra*=Skr. *vajra*, is described in Yt. X. 96 and 132 as a *zaēna*, “a missile” (from rt. *zi*=Skr. *hi*; comp. *heti*, “a javelin.” Even by *zaēna* in Yt. X. 141 is to be understood the club. The word, which usually denotes the handling of the *vazra*, is *ni-vij*, “to swing down, to dash down.” Cf. the epithet *hunivikhta*.

³ Hence Vd. XVIII. 30 speaks of the laying down of the *vazra*, *apa-yuj*, “to unfasten.”

⁴ Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, p. 202. According to Arnold, (“German Antiquity,” p. 274), clubs for smiting and for throwing were also used by the ancient Germans.

⁵ Yt. X. 96 and 132.

⁶ *Gadha*, Yt. X. 101; used with the epithet *ayañhaēna*, Yt. X. 131. The verb used with it is *ni-jan*, “to dash down.”

who crushes with it his enemy, man and horse at once. Similarly, Kersāspa, a hero of Irānian antiquity, is styled the club-bearer.¹

The *Chakusha*² must have been a weapon of a similar kind to the club. It is described as made of copper and double-pointed. Consequently, it was a pole-axe of metal, either end of which could be equally used. It is said of the Fravashis that they cause the Chakusha to reach the object at which it is thrown.

One of the most primitive weapons was the *sling*. Hence we find it in use amongst the most diverse, if not amongst all, nations inhabiting the globe.³ If handled with dexterity, it is in no way to be despised. In old Irān, its form must have been almost the same as among other nations.

The usual number of sling-stones,⁴ which the Irānians were accustomed to carry with them, was thirty. While the force of an arrow depended upon the elasticity of the bow-string, strength of arm was essential to the effective use of the sling.⁵

Like the sling the *bow* was used for fighting at a distance, but was probably regarded as superior in effect to the former.⁶

¹ *Gadhvara*, Ys. IX. 10; Yt. XIII. 61. *Gadha* (masc.) means "robber, murderer," then, apparently, "club-bearer."

² *Chakusha* (*haosafnaenibitaegha*, Yt. X. 130, *taegha*, "point"; *dāra*, "corner, edge") or *chakush*. *Aku* and *chaku* are similar weapons.

³ Tylor, *Anfänge der Cultur*, I. pp. 66, 74.

⁴ *Asna* or *zarshtra* - *fradakhshanya* (from *fradakhshana*, "sling"), Yt. X. 39.

⁵ Hence *fradakhshana* - *snāvare-bāzura* - *mat* - *thrisās* - *fradakhshanyāish*, "a sling, that has the arm for the string, with 30 sling-stones," Vd. XIV. 9 (cf. Vd. XVII. 9-10). *Asānō* - *aremōshuta*, "sling-stones thrown by means of the arm," Yt. XIII. 72.

⁶ *Thanvan*, *thanvare*, "bow," certainly, = Skr. *dhanvan*; *jya* and *snāvare*, "string."

It was formed of a curved piece of elastic wood, the two ends of which were fastened by means of a string made of the sinews of cattle.¹ When the bow was not used, the string was loosened in order not to deprive the wood of its flexibility. The tightening of the bow-string before the commencement of a battle is compared to the harnessing of the horse to the chariot.²

The Fravashis are armed with bows and kill the demons with their missiles. This weapon bears in the Avesta the expressive name of "battle-victor," which proves that it was in high favour with the Irānians.³

As regards the *arrow*,⁴ the different parts of it are to be distinguished. The shaft consisted, I believe, of a reed or a thin twig. The lower end at which the arrow rested on the string was called the "foot," and was generally made of horn.⁵ The arrow-head was made of brass, and was similarly called the "mouth," since it drank the enemy's blood.⁶ Below the point were fixed barbs of brass "sprouts," which were intended to render more difficult the extraction of the arrow from the wound.⁷

The shaft was adorned with feathers, which likewise

¹ Hence *gavasnāhē · snāvya · jya*; Yt. X. 128.

² *Thañj*, "to harness" (in the epithets *thakhta* and *hva-thakhta*) is said of the bow just as it is usually of the horse elsewhere.

³ Yt. XIII. 45. *Arezashi* from *āreza*, "fight," and *ji*, "to conquer."

⁴ "Arrow," *ishu* (= Skr. *ishu*), *asti* (from root *añh*, "to throw," from which is derived *añhu*, Yt. XIII. 46), *tighri* ("the point"; cf. Skr. *tigma*, Old Irānian *stij*, "point of a weapon," Yt. X. 71), *mana*, Ys. LVII. 28.

⁵ *Srvi-stayanām* (Yt. X. 129) is an epithet applied to *ishunām*. *Srvi* comes from *sru*, "horn," and *stayā* I derive from *stā*, "to stand," thus "possessing a horny foot."

⁶ *Ayō-aghra*, "with brazen point," Vd. XIV. 9. Comp. *yásya* *ayo* *múkham*, "the mouth of which is brass," Rig-veda, 7, 75, 15. *Zaranyō-zafra*, "with brazen mouth" (Yt. X. 129), poetically said of the arrow of Mithra.

⁷ *Ayañhaena · sparegha*, Yt. X. 129.

increased the velocity of the arrow. The same practice is found among the old Indians¹ who preferred the feathers of vultures and falcons for the purpose of ornamenting the arrow.²

The number of arrows which they were wont to carry with them was the same as the number of sling-stones, and they were placed in a *quiver*.³

Erkhsha is regarded in the Avesta as one of the most powerful archers. According to tradition, he is said to have shot with his arrow from the Khshautha mountain to the Qanvat mountain.⁴

Mithra is likewise armed with a bow, since he sends forth rays or darts of the sun.

The arrow is the symbol of swiftness. Hence it is said of the horses which drew the chariot of Srausha, that they were swifter than the rain-clouds, swifter than a well-darted arrow.⁵

In the Vedic antiquity the bow is esteemed as the noblest of weapons. "It helps towards dominion and glory, and remains even in the hand of the dead until the last moment before burial."⁶

"The bow allows us to conquer cattle,
With it we stand victorious in hot battles;
The bow creates discomfort to the enemy,
With it we conquer all the lands!"⁷

With the Avesta people it is rather the *spear* which plays so important a part. In the enumeration of weapons it is named first, then follows the sword, then the club, and then only the bow with quiver and arrows; lastly, the sling and the sling-stones.⁸

¹ Zimmer, *AiL*. p. 300.

² Hence the epithets *kahrkāsō-parena* and *erezisyō-parena*. Cf. *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 163-164.

³ Vd. XIV. 9, *zaēni* or *akana* may mean a "quiver."

⁴ Yt. VIII. 6 and 37. Comp. vol. I. p. 2.

⁵ Ys. LVII. 28, cf. vol. I. p. 176.

⁷ Rig-veda, 6, 75, 2.

⁶ Zimmer, *AiL*. p. 298.

⁸ Vd. XIV. 9.

The weapons effective in close combat likewise precede those suitable for distant fighting. With the old Indians the case was the reverse. The reason of this probably lies in the fact that the old Irānian warriors particularly practised close fighting in their more uneven territory. The Vedic Arians on the plains of the Panjāb must, on the contrary, have exercised themselves principally in wielding the bow.

The spear-head appears to have been edged. Consequently, the spear¹ receives the epithets "well-sharpened," "pointed," "sharp as an axe."² Its length also is referred to as worthy of note. "With a long and pointed spear" is an epithet applied to Mithra as the bold champion in all battles; it is likewise used of warriors generally.³

The spear was thrown. Whether the lance for thrusting was also known cannot be determined. I believe the charioteers first shot from a distance with their arrows, then they hurled their javelins, and lastly, when it came to close fighting, they, like the Homeric heroes, drew their swords.

"Away flies the spear, which an opponent of Mithra hurls, on account of the many vicious sayings which a Mithra-deceiver utters.⁴

"The pointed spears of the Mithra-deceivers, the well-sharpened, long-shafted ones, which fly from the arms, (and) do not hit the mark, when, irritated

¹ The spear is called *arshti* = Skr. *rshtī*. Often *arshti* is specially used for the shaft, wherefore the spear itself may be called *daregha-arshti*. Also *dru* in *darshi-dru* and *khruvī-dru*—“with frightful and bloody spear”—is a designation of the spear, just as *dāuru* (= Skr. *dāru*, “wood”) and *sūra* (= Skr. *cūla*).

² *Hukhshnūta*, *tighra*, Yt. X. 39; *barōithrō-taezha*, Yt. X. 130 (*barōithra* from rt. *bar* = Mod. Pers. *buridan*, “to cut.”)

³ Yt. X. 102; XVII. 12.

⁴ Yt. X. 20.

and embittered and raging, approaches Mithra, the lord over wide fields."¹

The *sword* of the old Irānian seems to have been a short weapon of handsome form like a cutlass. This we may infer from the same word being also a designation of the surgical knife of the physician.² It was made of brass and was double-edged,³ fastened to the girdle and borne either naked or in a scabbard. It was drawn when one had to fight at close quarters.⁴

The hilt of the sword was ornamented with golden aglets; its blade was engraved, as it seems, with marks and figures. Such a richly-decorated sword is worn by Verthragna, the *yazata* presiding over victory.⁵

Lastly, I further mention the *dagger*. Riders made use of it to goad on their steeds; nevertheless it is also found employed in fighting.⁶

Yima carries a gold-adorned dagger as a token of his sovereign power;⁷ likewise, Mithra bears this weapon;⁸ and, lastly, the heroes with rattling chariots and snorting steeds are also styled "daggers-swinging."⁹

¹ Yt. X. 39. Comp. Yt. X. 139, wherein it is said that the spears of Mithra, obeying the heavenly will, fly towards the head of the demons.

² *Kareta*, "sword, knife"; comp. Skr. *kṛti*, Rv. I. 168. 3, a weapon of the Marut.

³ *Ayañhaena*, Vd. IV. 50 (in Ys. XXXII. 7 *ayañh* is used just as the German "Stahl" for the "murderous weapon"); *uvayō-dāra*, Yt. X. 131.

⁴ *Hufrayukhta*, "well-girded," Yt. X. 40; *hufrāgharshta*, "well-drawn," Yt. XIII. 72. Comp. Skr. *pra-sṛj*.

⁵ Yt. XIV. 27.

⁶ Yt. X. 113.

⁷ *Ashtrām · zaranyō-paesim*, Vd. II. 7.

⁸ *Ashtrañhādh*, Yt. X. 112.

⁹ Yt. V. 130; XVII. 7: *khshvaçwayat-ashtra*.

§ 3. Legal Rights.

In treating of the legal usages of the Avesta people we meet with considerable difficulty. The sources which are at our disposal are all derived from the priesthood. All legal ideas and the institutions which they record represent essentially the views of the sacerdotal class.¹

The earliest mode of vindicating one's right was certainly self-redress or revenge.² This right of retaliation was first restrained by the tribunal of the commonalty, which was formed, we may be sure, amongst the old

¹ [Comp. Prof. M. Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*; Abbott's ed. vol. V. p. 201: "The rules concerning purity and purification, the expiations and penances necessary to avert the evil, which we possess in the Vendidād of the Avesta, are only the remnant of a far more comprehensive law. From the list of books and chapters traditional among the Parsees, we can see that it was intended to include not only all the invocations and prayers which the worship required, the rules of sacrifice and the entire ritual, together with the calendar of the ecclesiastical year, but also of the arrangement of the process of law, the civil and criminal code, and, moreover, rules for agriculture and medicine. If to this we add the statements and quotations of the Greeks, we may assume that the scriptures of Eastern Irān comprised the whole knowledge of the (*ancient*) priesthood. In the Avesta the Athravas had sketched the ideal picture of the correct conduct pleasing to Ahura Mazda in every department of life. How far the princes of Bactria and the viceroys of Cyaxares and the Achæmenids, or even these princes themselves, and the judges, wished or allowed themselves to be bound in their decisions by these regulations of the priests, may be left out of the question. The priests here, like the Brahmans in India, could only influence the action of the State and those charged with it, so far as the reverence for the principles of religion and the force of their own authority extended." *Tr. n.*]

² *Kaēna* = Mod. Pers. *kin* and *kīnah*.

Irānians in no less natural a way than amongst the other Indo-Germanic peoples. Most probably it was composed of the fully-authorized members of a village-community, in which the oldest member presided. The latter was the actual judge who pronounced the decision.¹

This tribunal had principally to decide upon the quarrels inevitable in civil life and which concerned the *meum et tuum*, disputes respecting boundaries, injuries to reputation and the like. Hence we may conclude that they can play no considerable part in the Vendidād.

If the Vendidād were a civil code, these very trials must occupy a large space. But in my opinion it is not so. For here we only meet with those causes wherein the priesthood reserved jurisdiction to themselves or added an ecclesiastical punishment to that of the secular judge. In such petty causes as those first referred to, the priests evidently renounced their right of jurisdiction, which would otherwise have imposed upon them a great burden without materially adding to their authority and influence.

Self-redress was, no doubt, mostly resorted to in cases of bodily hurt or murder. Blood demanded blood in return. If a free man had been slain by another, it was considered a right—nay, in the oldest times, a duty—to slay the murderer and so to expiate the crime.

¹ *Vichira* (Ys. XXIX. 4, and Ys. XLVI. 5) seems to be a name for the judge. The latter passage, which is very difficult to explain, apparently alludes to such a tribunal of the commonalty. Terms referring to right and law are not at all wanting, and they even directly prove the existence of a well-organized system. “Right,” I believe, is designated by *tkaesha* or *dāta-Urvākhshaya* in Ys. IX. 10 is distinctly called a “judge” (*tkaeshō-dātō-rāzō*). Evidently he was greatly renowned for his decisions. We may easily conceive that “right” was regarded as a creation and gift of Ahura and Zarathushtra (Vsp. II. 11; Ys. XVI. 2, etc.)

I believe that the custom of blood-feuds existed amongst the Eastern Irānians. Yet we must suppose that the Zoroastrian religion sought to restrain it, although it may never have succeeded in completely abolishing this system of revenge. Doubtless it continued to exist in full force against the non-Zoroastrians.

The incessant wars waged by the Irānians against the Tūrānians originated, according to the legend, in fulfilling this duty of revenging bloodshed. *Syāvarshan*, the son of Kavi Usan, was slain by the Tūrānians. His grandson, Kavi Husrava, takes the field against Frangasyan to revenge the outrage.

The origin of this legend can undoubtedly be traced to the Avesta. Here the genius Hauma, who aids the good cause, addresses to Druvāspa the following prayer:—

“ Grant me that I may fetter the pernicious Tūrānian *Frangasyan*, and that I may bring him bound and in fetters to Kavi Husrava; that *Kavi Husrava* may kill him behind the Lake Chaichasta, the deep, broad-waving, (*Kavi Husrava*) the son of the daughter of *Syāvarshan*, of the cruelly slain man and of the *Naruid Aghrairatha*.¹”

Another instance of revenge for bloodshed is mentioned in the Avesta in the family of Kersāspa. The brother of this hero has fallen by the hand of Hitāspa and is to be revenged. Therefore Kersāspa prays:—

“ Grant me, O Vayu, that I may revenge the blood of my brother *Urvākhshaya*; that I may kill *Hitāspa* and drag him behind my chariot.”²

The first check upon the right of retaliation is effected by enabling the murderer to secure immunity by means of an adequate compensation in money. This peaceable compensation can be much more easily effected in cases of

¹ Yt. IX. 18; XVII. 37. Cf. Yt. IX. 22; XVII. 42.

² Yt. XV. 28.

mere bodily injury than in those of actual murder. Such a compensation in money is called *weregild*.¹ At first, I believe, the injured person was free to accept the *weregild* or to demand blood for blood.

Wherever the State begins to cultivate the administration of justice and endeavours to restrain the freedom of self-redress, it will start with the institution of a *weregild*. Under certain circumstances the injured person is compelled to accept this money; under others he must abide by the verdict of the common-council; or, again, under others he is left to his choice.

So it was with the Avesta people. The *weregild* was well known to them. The Vendidad inculcates to the followers of Zoroastrianism not to refuse the *weregild* if offered in expiation of some deed of bloodshed.

Amongst the Avesta nation the regular *weregild* was paid chiefly in cattle and other kinds of moveable property. In most serious cases even women and maidens were offered, who were, I believe, married to the new possessors.

It is characteristic that the Vendidad mentions a "spiritual" mode of compensation, which probably consisted in some ecclesiastical atonement.²

¹ [In old English law *weregild* was the price or compensation paid by the murderer to the king for a man killed, partly to the lord of the vassal, and partly to the next-of-kin. *Vide Webster, Tr. n.*]

² The passage of the Vendidad (IV. 44) referring to the *weregild* comes immediately after the passage treating of bodily hurt. It runs thus: "If people come, fellow-believers, relatives, or friends, to expiate (*shaetō-chinaīhō*, cf. vol. I. p. 221, note 2) by money, or with (*giving in marriage*) a woman (*nāiri-chinaīhō*), or in the spiritual way (*khratu-chinaīhō*)—if they will expiate by money they shall bring up the money; if by a woman, they shall give in marriage a young maiden (to the person offended); if in the spiritual way, they shall recite the Holy Word." Etymologically *chinaīh* is of course connected with *chilha*, "expiation, punishment."

With the Afghāns blood-feuds and the weregild continue to the present day.

Families and houses are constantly engaged in quarrels and feuds. Family dissensions, provoked by deeds of bloodshed, fill up the whole life of an Afghān with hatred, enmity, and assassination. Legally this old custom of revenge for bloodshed is indeed prohibited; but secretly and under the cover of dissimulation hatred continually smoulders, to blaze forth on the first opportunity. The number of persons killed on both the sides is exactly known. Every one knows how many of the opposite party still must die to fill up the measure of vengeance. Until this is done, there is no rest or quiet.

Thus it happens that the blood-feud often continues through several generations, exacts numerous victims, and ruins the happiness and peace of all families. . . .

We have now to treat of those features of the Law, which are enumerated in the Vendīdād as subject to the competence of the priesthood. Transgressions against the ritual and ceremonial are the most frequent. Here it is likewise the special right and duty of the clergy to inflict punishment and to maintain their authority.

Punishments are prescribed for the non-exposure of dead bodies or for burying them. It is also regarded as a punishable act to throw a carcass on the ground; likewise to leave a corpse on the *dakhma* insecurely fastened, so that wild beasts carry away pieces of it. It is also punishable if one spreads *new* clothes over a dead body, or cultivates a piece of ground before it has been purified in the manner prescribed in the Avesta.

To these must be added transgressions against morality, particularly sexual intercourse with menstruating women, which are punished on the same principle. In short, wherever the Vendīdād lays down a ritual precept, it also

at the same time adds the punishment which shall be inflicted upon the guilty in case of transgression.¹

It is strange, and can only be explained from the peculiar views of the Zoroastrians, that also the ill-feeding and maltreatment of dogs were prosecuted as criminal.² But we must not here forget that the dog was reputed a sacred animal, and was esteemed in the same way as man.

Furthermore, it is characteristic, as regards the legal obligations of the Mazdayasna, that all compacts ought to be scrupulously maintained,³ and their violation strictly punished. Even towards unbelievers the Mazdayasna was obliged to respect every agreement.⁴

There were different kinds of agreement, varying according to the manner in which they were concluded, and according to the value of the object given in pledge.

"The first (*kind of*) agreement is that made by the given word; the second is made by a pledge with the hand (*i.e.*, by a hand-stroke); the third has the value of a head of small cattle (*i.e.*, a head of small cattle was given as security); the fourth has the value of a head of large cattle; the fifth has the value of a man; the sixth has the value of a piece of ground."⁵

¹ Vd. V. 14; III. 36 seq.; VI. 4 seq.; V. 43; VIII. 26 seq.; XVIII. 67 etc. The stereotyped expression is *yəzī nōit . . . kā hē asti chithā* "if (it is) not (done), what is the punishment for it?"

² Vd. XIII. 12 seq., 20 seq.; XV. 50-51. Cf. vol. I. p. 195.

³ *Mithra*, "contract, agreement"; *urvaiti*, "mutual promise." See vol. I. p. 164. The relation between employer and workman is considered to be a contract, Vd. III. 35 (*ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 425).

⁴ In Yt. X. 2, it is expressly stated: "The compact is binding on both (*i.e.* the opposite parties), on the pious as well as on the wicked ones."

⁵ Vd. IV. 2. Here *dānhu* of course does not denote "country" in its political sense but simply "land, landed property, real estate." It is impossible that *pasu*, *staora*, etc., can in this

Evidently any agreement whatever could be ranged under one of these six categories, according as it was to be made more or less binding. The mere word, or the giving of the hand, was sufficient to give legal value to an agreement. But to gain greater security, a pledge of more or less value was often demanded; or it was even freely offered to enhance one's obligation.

When the agreement was not kept, the pledge was forfeited. This might include, as we have seen, even persons. Probably the person himself who made the bargain, or one of his near relations, stood bail or surety. If the engagement was not fulfilled the surety lost his liberty, and his life and property were forfeited to the

passage signify the object of the contract. In this case the two first kinds would not agree with the following, since with these no object is generally named. That this view of mine is correct, is proved by what follows in the text which evidently contains a more detailed description of the different kinds of contract: "The given word confirms the first kind of contract; something that has the value of a handstroke (*or the offering of the hand as pledge of a solemn promise*) effects the second kind, *i.e.*, something that has the value of a handstroke must be offered as a pledge of the agreement. Something that has the value of a sheep makes the third kind of contract, *i.e.*, something that has the value of a sheep must be offered as a pledge in making the agreement. Something that has the price of an ox or cow effects the fourth kind, *i.e.*, something of the value of a head of cattle must be offered as a pledge of the agreement. Something that has the value of a man concludes the fifth kind of contract, *i.e.*, something must be offered that has the worth of a man. Something that is worth a field confirms the sixth kind of contract, *i.e.*, something of the price of a field must be offered (as a pledge) in concluding the agreement." *Ira-marez* (Vd. IV. 3-4) must be the expression denoting the making of a contract. This is proved by the compound *zastō marshṭā*, "confirmed by the handstroke." It is surprising that of the second kind it is not simply said as of the first *zastō · bitim · mithrem · kerenaonī*; but that here a pledge is mentioned.

opposite party. If I am not mistaken, in case of a broken agreement, the relations of a debtor in general might be called to account, so that they were obliged to answer for the payment of the amount of compensation.¹

Finally, I mention cases of bodily injury which, as the Vendidād says, were punished according to the complete or at least partial competence of the priesthood.

Even a simple attack upon a person was regarded as culpable; every repetition of the offence considerably enhanced the guilt. Corporal injuries were punished according to the consequences caused to the injured person.

The Vendidād, therefore, distinguishes the following transgressions:—

If a man stretches out the hand to give a blow to another it is an *Agerpta*, an "attack." If one lays hands on another it is an *Avaaurishṭa*, a "surprise."

By these two transgressions the Vendidād seems to understand such as were committed without any evil premeditation, perhaps provoked by anger and passion. For it says further on: "If a man attacks any person with a malicious intention it is an *Ardush*. By the fifth of the *ardush-sins* the body is forfeited."²

I do not think any peculiar kind of wounding is signified by *Ardush*. Bodily hurt is even spoken of more widely and under the threat of greater punishments. Firstly, the Vendidād speaks of the wound which bleeds but a little; secondly, the wound from which the blood flows; then

¹ This, at least, seems to be the meaning of the passage Vd. IV. 5-10, although I do not fully understand the connection of this passage with the following.

² Vd. IV. 7. *Agerpta* is derived from *ā* and *garew*; *avaoirishṭa* perhaps from *ava* and *urvis* (cf. Sk. *vṛacch*, "to hew, to split"); *aredush* certainly comes from the root *ared* = Skr. *rd.*, "to torment, to hurt, to violate."

the stroke by which a bone is broken; finally, any injury which causes insensibility.¹

Let us now examine the kinds of punishment prescribed by the Vendidād for these different crimes. They prove clearly that the Vendidād is, indeed, only a legal code instituted by the priesthood and entirely independent of secular judgments and tribunals.

Capital punishment is not unheard of. Yet it is characteristic enough that the Vendidād does not assign it to murder or manslaughter. It is instead awarded to any one who exercises priestly functions without being competent and without having the necessary knowledge²

But, finally, the form of punishment by far most common in the Vendidād is that by means of *upāzana*, which word is regularly translated by "stripe or stroke," more correctly by "bringing in or delivery."³

I have often put to myself the question whether by *upāzanas* are to be understood stripes that are inflicted on the culprit.

¹ *Vikhrūmen̄tem · qarem, tachat-vōhunim · qarem, astō-bidhem · qarem, frāzā-baodhaīhem · snathem.* Vd. IV. 30, 34, 37, 40. The last expression is translated by Dr. Justi: "depriving of one's life." This seems to be incorrect. *Baodhaīh* must be translated "sensibility, consciousness." If murder were meant, it is certain that a far more severe punishment must have been fixed, particularly in relation to the trespasses immediately preceding.

² Vd. IX. 47, 49. Also Vd. IV. 50, alludes to capital punishment, specially to decapitation by the sword. The words are: *Ayaīhaenāish · karetaish · azdēbīsh · paiti · ava-kerethyāt*. The intrinsic connection of the passage is quite obscure.

³ *Upāzana* is derived from *upa* and *az* = Sanskrit *upa-aj*, "to drive by." Tradition has erroneously conceived the meaning of this word, for it traces it to Phlv. *zanishn*, "stroke." [Cf. Spiegel, E. A. vol. III. p. 696. "Eine der gewöhnlichsten Bussen scheint des Tödten einer Anzahl schädlicher Thiere gewesen zu sein, darauf scheinen sich die Zutreibungen (nach der Uebersetzung Schläge) zu heziehen, von welchen im Vendidād so oft die Rede ist." Tr. n.]

I am now of opinion that this is impossible; nay, that this supposition contradicts common sense.

The very instrument that must serve for giving strokes, the goad that was used to drive horses, is not quite adapted for this purpose. The whip that is mentioned afterwards would be more appropriate.¹

Still more striking are the numbers given in the Vendidād. Two hundred strokes with the goad and two hundred stripes with the whip are indeed very common. They are inflicted for bringing fire into an impure dwelling. Whoever cultivates a piece of ground polluted by anything dead before a year has passed, shall also be liable to the same penalty; nay, even a woman shall be similarly punished who drinks water immediately after her delivery.² Whoever flings a bone into a field, must receive twice six hundred stripes.

This is simple brutality to which no man on the whole earth, not even the most abject and ignorant, would submit.³ I doubt also very much if any man could have physical strength to bear twelve hundred strokes of goad and whip; and certainly neither extraneous nor native testimony exhibits the Irānian priests as barbarians and tyrants. Yet they would have been so, if they had employed this cruel form of bodily chastisement.

¹ *Aspahē·ashtra, sraoshō-charana.* M. Darmesteter (Vend. Introduction, V. § 19), indeed, conjectures that both the Avesta words designate the same instrument; but this opinion is contradicted by the words of the text, which always run thus:—

*Upāzana · upāzōit · aspahē · ashtraya, *sraoshō-charanaya.*

² Vd. V. 44; VI. 5; VII. 72.

³ [In the absence of any indigenous definition of the word, indeed, it is impossible at the present stage of Irānian research to give a positive description of the kind of instrument called the *upāzana*, or to found any opinion as regards the legal usages of the Avesta people on the mere ground of individual hypothesis.
Tr. n.]

I also believe that a hierarchy that used such means would soon have been overthrown. A single execution of this kind, or two, would have sufficed to incite the whole people to discontent and revolt.

The *upāzana* even amount to two thousand. This number of stripes is to be inflicted on any one who interts dead dogs or men in the earth and does not disinter them within a year,¹ a transgression which is undoubtedly regarded from a Zoroastrian stand-point as a very heavy crime. The same punishment is prescribed for spreading a *new* garment over a dead body, as well as for sprinkling water over the corpse of a man or dog.²

This would be so irrational, so ridiculous, a mode of punishment, that even opponents of the Zoroastrian system must allow that there cannot be any question here of actual blows. But if we are forced to make this concession, is it not much more reasonable to say that *upāzana* must not be translated by "stroke or stripe"?

So it will be advisable to adopt the original opinion of Dr. Spiegel concerning the *upāzana*. According to his idea the point in question is not respecting the strokes or stripes inflicted on the culprit, but on the empire of the evil spirits as it were for the sake of compensation. The question is regarding the destruction of certain obnoxious and impure animals and the delivery of the animals killed to the priest. This conception is best expressed by the term "delivery."

Herodotus relates that the Magi destroy ants, serpents, and other creeping and flying animals. The same is said by Agathias of the Persians generally; and he also remarks that they bring the animals when killed to their priests.³

¹ Vd. III. 37. *ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. (1880), p. 426, note.

² Vd. VIII. 25; VI. 25.

³ Herodotus, I. 140; Agathias, II. 24. Cf. Spiegel, *Commn.* vol. I. pp. 109 seq.

The "goad" is evidently a pointed instrument with which serpents, toads and similar vermin were destroyed. The whip, as Dr. Spiegel supposes, was perhaps a kind of fly-flap. The two instruments, as the Vendidād seems to indicate, were really made use of for killing similar animals.¹

I repeat here that the Vendidād is by no means a civil code. It contains only the discipline practised by the priesthood. Hence it is self-evident why direct transgressions against religious precepts are punished most severely. If the expiation consisted only in the delivery of *khrafstras* slain, it might also amount to large sums of money. And it may be assumed that people must, at an early period, have relieved themselves from their obligations by the payment of money instead of the prescribed penalty. The scourge could never have been used to such an extent without provoking opposition.

Trespasses against public order and security were tried before the secular tribunal. Respecting such cases, too, does the Vendidād prescribe atonements in some places. These were evidently additional to the punishments decreed by the secular judge, and the priesthood thereby made the people understand that they also partook in the vindication of the law.

But this circumstance will explain, why comparatively milder punishments are laid down in the Vendidād for those very transgressions. Twice five *upāzana* are set down for an *āgerpta*, twice ten for an *avaurishta*, and twice fifteen for an *ardush*. Furthermore, mutilations of the body are punished with twice thirty, fifty, seventy, ninety *upāzana*. On the contrary, for a contamination, which is merely accidental and by no means culpable, no less than twice four hundred *upāzana*

¹ *Khrafstraghnam-sraoshō-charanaya*, Vd. XIV. 8; *ashtrām-mairim*, Vd. XVIII. 4.

are prescribed.¹ This, I think, shows evidently that the *upāzana* do not in general bear properly the character of a punishment. They are rather a kind of expiation, whereby every triumph gained by the empire of evil shall be compensated by an equivalent invasion and defeat of the same.

The breaking of an engagement is, according to the Avesta, a crime against Mithra, i.e., against God and religion. Here, therefore, we meet again with very high numbers of *upāzana*. They begin from twice three hundred *upāzana*, and rise to twice a thousand. The former are prescribed for breaking one's word, the latter for breaking a contract of the sixth and highest kind.

It is to be observed that, from breaking a given word to breaking a pledge given by the hand, the expiation abruptly rises from twice three hundred to twice six hundred *upāzana*. After this it rises for each distinct kind of breach of contract by one hundred *upāzana* only.

Sometimes it may have happened that the perpetrator of some crime could not be found out with certainty. To clear up doubts the ordeal was resorted to. People believed that God himself would decide in a supernatural way, and would bring to light guilt and innocence.

The ordeal was an institution common to all Indo-Germanic peoples.

The Indians principally made use of the ordeal by fire, which consisted in taking an oath while holding in the hand some burning object, probably a red-hot hatchet. Besides

¹ Thus Vd. VIII. 104. Here the question refers to a man who has come in contact with a corpse in the desert. The precept is that he must go immediately to the nearest village or hamlet, in order to be purified. If on his way he passes by water or plants, these are sullied by him. This sin must be expiated by an adequate and rather considerable number of *upāzana*.

this, a series of other ordeals was known, in which those by water and poison were considered the most formidable.¹

Among the ancient Germans, too, some causes were occasionally decided by means of ordeals. It was quite in keeping with their warlike spirit that a duel between the two contending parties, or trial by combat, was preferred as an ordeal.²

Firdūsī doubtless supposes the ordeal to have been customary with the Persian people from time immemorial. I only mention the account of Siyāvush, who cleared himself from the ignominious calumnies of Sudābe by the ordeal by fire.

He rode on horseback between two huge burning piles of wood and issued from the flames safe and sound amidst the loud acclamations of the people. His innocence was thus thought to have been proved.³

The Vendidād alludes to an ordeal performed with boiling water.⁴ Yet the context is altogether obscure. Whoever appealed to such an ordeal in a frivolous manner, was, it seems, punished with twice seven hundred *upāzana*.⁵

We must doubtless conclude from the Gāthās, that in doubtful cases the will and judgment of the Deity was understood from the flames of the (*sacred*) fire:—

“The sentence which Thou, O Spirit, gavest through
Fire in a holy manner to the two litigant parties,
The doctrine to the attentive: These announce unto
us, O Mazda, that we may know it

¹ Zimmer, *AiL.* pp. 183-184.

² Arnold, “German Antiquity,” p. 341.

³ Cf. Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. I. pp. 597-598.

⁴ *Hām-tāptibyō · airoyō · chākhrare · nerebyō*, Zarathushtra, (Vd. IV. 46). Cf. Vd. IV. 54 *āpem · saokeñtavaitim · zaranyāvaitim · vihushavaitim*.

⁵ Vd. IV. 55.

With the tongue of Thy mouth, that I may convert
thereby all living men to (*Thy*) faith.”¹

It seems that some apostle of the Zoroastrian doctrine here appeals to a fire oracle in order to prove his divine mission. How this was done, we do not know. “The bursting of flames, the rising spark, the crackling of fuel and the shapes taken by smoke, are but a symbolical language, at least as easy to understand as the rustling of the oak at Dodona, or the feeding of chickens, or the appearance of the intestines of animals.”²

An actual ordeal by means of fire and molten metal is meant in the following passage :—

“ The sentence which Thou gavest to the two litigant parties by Thy red fire, O Mazda,

And by molten metal, to set a mark among living beings,

To hurt the demons, but to give help to the just one!”³

Finally, I shall quote a strophe containing, in my opinion, a prayer spoken before the beginning of the ordeal. The accused person who undergoes it, apparently invokes the Deity to evince the truth by some token :—

“ I will conceive Thee as the strong and the blissful, Mazda,

That by Thy hand, with which thou bestowest help,

Since Thou gavest judgment on the wicked and the just

By the glow of Thy strong fire, in holiness,

May the victory of the pious mind fall to my lot.”⁴

¹ Ys. XXXI. 3: *Rāna* is certainly not = Skr. *arāni* as Haug supposes. This is etymologically impossible. That I have correctly translated the word by “ combatant, litigant party,” is probably proved from Ys. XLIII. 4, which is quoted below.

² Roth, *Yaqna*, XXXI. p. 20.

³ Ys. LI. 9.

⁴ Ys. XLIII. 4. *Ashish* is here used in the same sense and connection as *khshnūtem* in the two other passages; but in *dregvāitē · ashāunaēchā* it is used as *rānōibyā* in other passages.

CHAPTER II.

ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONS.

§ 4. *The Priesthood.*

IT cannot be denied that the Avesta concedes to the priesthood a position of the highest eminence in the old Irānian commonwealth.¹ Wherever the different professions are named together, the priests stand first in the enumeration. Their calling is reputed the noblest, and they alone formed to some extent a sort of caste distinct from the rest of the community.

We will understand this circumstance more fully if we keep in view the character and tendency of the Avesta. I have no hesitation in regarding it as a work much less national

¹ [Comp. Max. Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*. (The History of Antiquity), Abbott's ed. vol. V. pp. 187-189.

"The priesthood could very well claim precedence of the warriors; on their prayers and sayings, their knowledge of the custom of sacrifice, depended the favour of the divinities, the power of averting evil spirits, the removal of pollution, salvation in this world and the next. Yet they could not obtain such a position as the Brāhmans held on the Ganges after the reform of the ancient faith and the victory of Brahma over Indra. For in Iran there was no order of Cudras, no vanquished remnant of an old population, which created a sharp line of division even among the orders of the Aryas; and moreover the Brāhmans were the first-born of Brahma, a purer incarnation of the divine nature than any other . . . While the priests of Iran in their lives studied especially purity of body and mind; and they were pre-eminently "the pure men." Only by their means, at any rate with their assistance, could sacrifice be offered; from their mouths alone could the correct invocations be uttered to the divine beings and the evil ones be driven away. . . . The priesthood of Iran perpetuated their knowledge and their wisdom in their families." *Tr. n.*]

than the Rig-veda. It is rather a code of the priesthood, written in their own interest, and especially representing their own ideas. Thus the Avesta naturally embodies whatever the priests claim for themselves. Similarly, the Brāhmans of the Indian commonwealth declare themselves, in the post-Vedic age, the noblest caste, and the earliest and purest emanation of the soul of the world.

Indian literature is much more copious than the Irānian. In the former we can trace how the caste of the Brāhmans continued to rise above the rest of the people ; how it gained, by degrees, the means of assuming to itself such importance and sanctity.

In the later Avesta we observe the results of an analogous process of development. Here also the priesthood can claim to be reputed and considered the first order in the State. It is evident that it had a certain, although only a moral, preponderance in the commonwealth, and that it was regarded with special veneration by the people. But the different phases and degrees of this gradual development are yet unknown to us.

Besides, we cannot fairly attribute to the priests of the Avesta any inordinate desire for power. They were moderate in their claims. Nowhere did they overstep the bounds of their natural dominion, their power over spirits and their observance of religion' and of divine worship.

Even in the administration of justice, there were but few departments in which their authority could clash with that of the secular tribunal. Here also they were generally restricted to such cases in which jurisdiction was their natural right. It can hardly be proved that the priesthood as such encroached, either directly or indirectly, upon the government of the State, in which the princes and commonwealth evidently enjoyed full liberty, even after Zoroastrianism had become the acknowledged and dominant religion.

The priests style themselves *Āthravans* or *Atharvans*. This name is intimately connected with the fire-cult.¹ The tending of the sacred fire, therefore, must have been, even at an early period, one of the principal duties of the Avesta priest.

So early as in the remotest Arian antiquity *Atharvan* evidently meant a fire-priest. The word has likewise in Indian literature the same, or at least a similar, significance.

Brihaddiva, a Vedic minstrel, calls himself an *Atharvan*. The Soma priests also, whose duty it is to prepare the sacred drink, are called *Atharvans*. Finally, the fire-god Agni, too, it seems, bears this title. He is himself the priest of men, who bears up to heaven prayers and sacrifices in his blazing flames.²

In several passages of the Rig-veda, too, *Atharvan* appears to be a mythical being.³ He is the Indian Prometheus who brings down the fire of the gods after he has produced it by means of friction in the heavenly regions. So we may recognize in him the prototype of all Indian priests who learned from him their divine ritual and calling.⁴

In the Gāthās the word *Āthravan* does not occur. This is of course strange, since the context certainly offers frequent occasion for naming the Zoroastrian priesthood as

¹ *Āthravan*, *Atharvan*. The former name may be connected, I believe, with *ātare*, "fire." The *th* is explained by the *r* following. The latter name, on the other hand, must be explained differently. I refer it to Skr. *atharyu*, "flaming," which is in Rv. 7. 1. 1. the epithet of Agni, and also to *athari*, "flame," in *atharyō nā dūntām*, Rv. 4. 6. 8.

² Rv. 10. 120. 8; 9. 11. 2; 8. 9. 7.

³ In Rv. 1. 80. 16. *Atharvan* is identified with the Father Manu and with Dadhyach. In Rv. 6. 16. 4. he is called the son of Dadhyach. In Rv. 1. 83. 5. it is he who first prepared, by offering sacrifice, the way to the gods. In Rv. 10. 87. 12. *Atharvan*, like Agni, seems to be the Lord of Lightning.

⁴ Rv. 6. 16. 13; 10. 12. 5. Cf. Rv. 6. 15. 17.

such. Evidently, therefore, the word had, in the oldest period, no official and solemn collective appellation.

The conditions described in the Gāthās were completely immature and undeveloped. On the contrary, the hymns launch us into an epoch of mighty social and religious agitation. The doctrine of Zarathushtra was evidently not yet generally acknowledged. It was still struggling for existence. It was just beginning to diffuse itself among the people.

In such times it was quite impossible for the Irānian priests to form themselves into an exclusive, compact, organized body. Before the religion preached by priests had completely taken root in the hearts of the people, before peace and repose had taken the place of national conflict, no priestly order could exist. The elevation of the Brāhmans, too, dates from a period of transition in which the Indian people passed from an epoch of warfare and conquest, into one of comfortable repose and undisturbed tranquillity.

In the era represented by the Gāthās, there were, it is true, priests and preachers of the Zoroastrian belief. But they had not yet united together into a guild, separating themselves from the rest of the people. This was only possible at a later period, and then only must the general appellation for the priesthood have been adopted. It was taken from an old and venerable term, which designated in the very earliest times the ministers of the sacred fire.

The priests of the old natural religion, which was opposed to Zoroastrianism, were called *Kavi* and *Usij*.¹

¹ *Kavi* and *usij* = Skr. *kavi* and *ucij*. Tradition translates *kavi* by "blind." The word comes from *ku*, "to see." Thus it originally designated the "seer." In the Old Irānian dialect this meaning was entirely changed. Cognate with *kavi* is, I believe, *vaepayā · kevinō*, Ys. LI. 12, signifying perhaps "an incestuous (*cf.* root *vip*) pseudo-priest."

The two names, so detestable and abominable to the Avesta, are found in the Rig-veda as denominations of sacrificing priests and chanters of hymns.

But from this we are not to conclude that it was the Zoroastrian Reform which caused the separation of the Arians into two different tribes and the migration of those tribes which afterwards settled in India. This event was, in my opinion, the result rather of social embarrassments.

It is probable, nay, indeed certain, that, even after their separation, the Irānians continued for a long time to do homage to the old deities under their old priests. The length of this period cannot be ascertained. At its close we hear of the Reform, named after Zarathushtra, by which the Arian gods of light were prescribed as demons and their priests condemned as heterodox.

Besides the Kavis and Usij, the *Karapans*¹ are mentioned as hostile priests. This name, being indeed obscure, admits of no connection with old Indian conditions.

In a highly interesting passage we find the Karapans standing in the midst of a social revolution :—

“Why, Oh Mazda, are the devils so mighty?

And, therefore, I ask Thee, who will then fight them?

In alliance with them the *Usij* and *Karapans* ruin the cattle,

And by which the *Kavis* grew up to power.

Not with justice dost Thou cause their pastures to thrive, fertilising them.”²

Here they side apparently with a less civilized, half nomadic people, who do not take proper care of their herds and flocks. The follower of Zarathushtra opposes them vigorously. But fortune does not always favour him. With bitter

¹ *Karapan*. The etymology of this word is obscure. Tradition makes it mean “deaf.” (*Cf.* the foregoing note).

² Ys. XLIV, 20.

complaints does he address himself to *his* God, Mazda, murmuring that the latter does not withdraw His blessing from the unbelievers to grant it to the pious people.

Very often the false priests and heretics allied themselves with princes and thus, aided by temporal power, they oppressed the new doctrine.¹ Not in all places was the Zarathushtrian Reform willingly and readily accepted by the nobles and grandees.

The passage in which the *Karapans* appear as the priests of intoxicating beverage is also highly characteristic:—

“ When will, O Mazda, the men of wisdom step forth ?

When will they drive away the filth of this intoxication,

(lit. *intoxicating drink*)

Of which vice the *Karapans* are proud

And the wicked rulers of countries ? ”²

There can be no doubt that this zealous appeal was directed against the *Soma*-cult, to which, in consequence of its licentiousness, the stern minds of the reformers opposed themselves. But here the popular belief remained victorious. Perhaps some success was achieved in restraining the most offensive excesses connected with *Soma*-worship. But the attempt to extirpate it entirely proved vain. In the later Avesta, Hauma maintains his place among the *yazatas*, and the *Mazdayasnian* priests prepare that holy nectar just like the Indian Brāhmans.

The opposition of the old priests was gradually broken. The new doctrine triumphed, while the natural religion of the Arians disappeared. Thus the names of the *Kavis* and *Karapans* gradually lost the vivid signification, which they bear in the *Gāthās*. They are preserved in the later

¹ Ys. XLVI. 11. Cf. above pp. 14-15.

² Ys. XLVIII. 10. Cf. Haug, *Gāthās*, vol. II. p. 241. Too bold, indeed, is the supposition that in Ys. XXXII. 3, the word *shkyaomām* (var. *shaomām* and *ashyaomām*) designates *Hauma* with his Indian name *Soma*. [Schlechten=lit. “being so bad.”]

scriptures only in the customary and stereotyped enumeration of evil beings. There they appear along with the *Yātus*, the *Parikas*, the *Daevas* and the *Ashemaughas*.¹ But I do not believe that any clear and definite idea was formed of them.

I shall now treat of the duties and the dignity of the *Athravans* according to the statements of the later Avesta.

The principal task of the priests was to cultivate their religion. They had regularly to perform divine service and to fulfil certain sacrificial functions. They prepared and consecrated the Hauma-drink and kept the sacred fire. Lastly, they performed, according to fixed precepts, the purificatory ritual on persons who had come in contact with unclean things.²

Herodotus gives us a description of the sacrifices offered by the Persians. With his narrative may be compared what Strabo relates regarding the same subject.³

"They ascend to the highest parts of the mountains and offer sacrifices to Zeus, by whose name they designate the

¹ *Vide* Ys. IX. 18; Yt. I. 10, II; Yt. V. 13, X. 34. A signification similar to that of *Karapan* and *Kavi* may be attached to the quite obscure names *Kaqaredha*, *Kaqareidhi*, *Kayadha*, *Kayeidhi*. By the way, I must mention that *Kavi* has occasionally a very honourable meaning. For it is found in a certain family of Eastern Irān, well-renowned in the legends, as a title constantly added before their proper names. The Avesta mentions, as early as in the Gāthās, *Kavi-Vishtāspa* as a mighty protector of the Mazdian faith. There are mentioned also:—*Kavi Usan* or *Usadhan*, who vanquished the demons and subjugated their countries (Yt. V. 45-47.), *Kavi Kavāta*, *Kavi Syāvarshan*, *Kavi Husrava*. In Firdūsi's "Book of Kings" they form the dynasty of the Kayānians, who ascended the throne of Irān after the Peshdādians.

² Compare the passage Vd. XVIII. 1-6, quoted further on.

³ Her. I. 131-132; Strabo, pp. 732-733. Cf. Windischmann, Z. St. pp. 294 seq., Duncker, *GdA.* vol. IV. pp. 131-132; Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. pp. 590-591.

whole sphere of the heavens. Besides, they also offer sacrifices to the sun, moon, fire, water, and winds. But, when they are about to sacrifice, they do not erect altars nor kindle any fire; nor do they use libations, nor have they flute-playing, sacrificial cakes, or rough-ground corn. If anybody wishes to offer sacrifice to any one of the deities, he leads the victim to a clean spot and invokes the deity after having decked his tiara with myrtle twigs. When he has cut the animal into small pieces and boiled the flesh, he strews a bed of tender grass, specially trefoil, and lays all the flesh on it. One of the Magi standing by sings the theogonic hymn; for this, they say, is the accompanying song; and without one of the Magi they are not permitted to offer any sacrifice. After some time he that has offered sacrifice carries away the flesh and disposes of it as he thinks proper."

This account of Herodotus evidently bears the stamp of an intimate knowledge of his subject. According to his statement, burnt offerings were not customary; the sacrifice itself is performed by the priest, who accompanies it with a hymn which is chanted principally to consecrate the victim offered.

It is obvious that whatever Herodotus relates of the Persians and the Magi, cannot be implicitly stated regarding the Eastern Irānians. However, we can easily make out some conformity, which is hardly casual, between the usages of the Persians and those of the Avesta priests, and especially in the most important points.

That the Avesta priests did not burn their victims, is self-evident. Fire was regarded by them as sacred; it would be sullied by any dead body.

On the other hand, animal sacrifices are frequently mentioned in the Avesta. Haushyangha, Yima, Thraitauna, Kersāspa, Kavi Usan, Kavi Husrava, and other legendary kings and heroes, nay, even the enemies of the Avesta people, Azhi Dahāka, Frangrsyan and the Hunus, bring as

offerings to Anāhita, to Rāman, to Vayu and to other *yazatas*, a hundred stallions, a thousand head of cattle, and ten thousand sheep.¹ The sacrifice is always accompanied by a prayer to fulfil some special desire. The numbers are evidently exaggerated. But they are intended merely to depict in glowing colours the glory and abundance of the heroic age.

Light-coloured animals were preferred for sacrifice. They were killed quite according to the Persian custom and their flesh boiled.² Frequently a festival repast was prepared.³ Thus the sacrifices of the Avesta people had the character of a consecration rather than of an offering.

A still closer resemblance may be traced. The sacrificial ritual was, as Herodotus relates of the Persians, accompanied with the recitation of the sacred texts. The Avesta very frequently alludes to these solemn recitations, in which Gāthās or holy hymns were preferred.⁴ They are, therefore, joined to the Yasna, which is, on the whole, nothing but a collection of texts to be recited in divine worship.

Finally, it is stated by Herodotus that the Magi were accustomed to strew the ground with tender grass when making sacrificial offerings. This usage dates from the earliest Arian era. The same was, at least originally,

¹ Yt. V. 21, 25, 29 seq.; Yt. IX. 3, 8, 13 seq.; Yt. XV. 7, 15, 19 seq.; Yt. XVII. 24, 28, 37 seq.

² *Pach*, "to cook," is the term used for sacrificing an animal. Yt. VIII. 58; XIV. 50: "The Arian countries shall *cook* unto him (unto Tishtrya or Verthragna) sheep, bright, fine-coloured, or of any other colour resembling that of the Hauma plant."

³ Festival and sacrificial repast is meant by *myazda* = Skr. *medha*, Mod. Persian *mayazd* or *myazd* "convivium, epulae" (Vuller's *Lex. sub voce*). *Myazd* has, of course, no connection with *mai*, "wine."

⁴ "To recite" is *dreñj* and *srāvaya*, particularly *fra-srāvaya*. Cf. also Spiegel, *Av. üb.*, vol. II. pp. lxii. seq.

practised by the Avesta priests.¹ The Indian Brāhmans, too, strewed consecrated grass near the altar while the sacrificial fire was blazing on it. The ground thus strewn was meant to serve as a seat to the deities, who were invited to the sacrificial repast. The invocation addressed to the genii to come down and sit on the *Barhis* is, therefore, a stereotyped formula in the Rig-veda.

Gradually this custom became modified among the Irānian priests, who only held in their hands a bunch of twigs while offering sacrifice. We do not know when this change took place, but it must have been at a very early period. Even Strabo narrates that the Magi held a bunch of fine tamarisk twigs while chanting sacrificial hymns.

Furthermore, the statement that libations were unknown to the Persians can hardly be said to contradict the authority of the Avesta. In offering up sacrifices, a sacred beverage, *Zauthra*, was indeed prepared and consecrated. Besides, this consecration forms, no doubt, the central point of the whole solemnity; hence the ministering priest is called *Zautar*.² But the Avesta does not relate that the beverage was distributed and poured out or offered to the *yazatas*.

The sacred beverage is the *Hauma* or the *Parahauma*. It consisted, we know, of the juice of the Hauma plant, which was mixed with milk and often seasoned by adding the extract of another plant called *Hadhānaipāta*.³

¹ *Vide* Yt. VIII. 58; XIV. 50. Still it is said in the Avesta: *baresma, fra-stāraya*, "to spread the grass for the purpose of offering." (*Cf.* Skr. *barhis* derived from a cognate root). *Cf.* also Vsp. XI. 2, *stareta*, probably meaning "the grass spread for a sacrificial purpose."

² *Zaothra, zaotare* = Skr. *hotra, hotṛ*, from rt. *zu*. = Skr. *hu*.

³ *Cf.* O. K. A. pp. 230-231. I think that *gāush*, *hudhāo*, *haurvatalāt* and *ameretāt*, which are mentioned in Ys. III. 1, IV. 1, &c., as sacrificial gifts, denote the three principal ingredients of the sacred beverage, viz., milk, the water added to the beverage, and the plant itself.

The name Hauma denoted not merely the plant and the beverage prepared from it, but at the same time a *yazata*.¹

The three significations are so intermingled that it is almost impossible to distinguish them.

Several miraculous powers were ascribed to Hauma. The beverage is health-giving; it wards off death from man. As it animates pious enthusiasm, it is called "source of piety."²

The consecration of this beverage in the sacrificial ceremony is accompanied by the recitation of a great many hymns of praise,³ all of which extol the blissful effects of Hauma. He is invoked to give health and strength, protection from enemies, thieves and murderers, and victory in the chariot race. Married women beg of him to grant an easy delivery; maidens pray for husbands. He protects from venomous serpents and from the allurements of courtezans. Everything good is due to his blessing:

"I ask thee for enthusiasm,

For strength and victory,

For health and remedy,

For thrift and growth;

I pray that I may walk

Among the people, lord of my wishes,

Conquering the enemies and vanquishing the wicked."⁴

A very comprehensive prayer to Hauma runs as follows:—

"This first gift I require of thee,

O Hauma, who keepest away death:

¹ [Also Hauma seems to be the name of a renowned warrior in the Avesta period. Ashi Yasht, 37-39: "He (Hauma) begged of her (Ashi) a boon, saying: Grant me this, O great Ashi Vāghvi! that I may bind the Turanian murderer, Frangrasyan, that I may drag him bound, that I may bring him bound, unto King Husravah that King Husravah may kill him, behind the lake Chaechasta, to avenge the murder of his father, Syāvarshāna, and of Aghraeratha." *Tr. n.*]

² Cf. the epithets *baēshazyā*, *dūraošha* and *ashahē-khāo*.

³ Ys. IX. and X.

⁴ Ys. IX. 17.

The paradise of the pious,
The all-blissful light ;
This second blessing I entreat of thee,
O Hauma, who keepest away death :
Health for this my body ;

• • • • •
That, alert, strong and contented,
I may walk on earth,
Conquering the enemies, vanquishing the demons ;

• • • • •
That I may walk on earth
Victorious and gaining battles,
Conquering the enemies, vanquishing the demons ;

• • • • •
That, first, the thief and the robber
And the wolf we may perceive ;
That none of them may observe us (before we
perceive them) !”¹

In passing I may mention that the name *Hauma* corresponds in the Indian language to *Soma*. The Rig-veda designates by it, like the Avesta, a plant, a sacred beverage, and a powerful deity presiding over both.

The Vedic *Soma*-worship has already been fully treated by several writers. Likewise, the relations between the Irānian Hauma-service and the Indian Soma-worship have already been described in detail. The investigation has proved that this worship chiefly dates from the Arian period and has developed its peculiar features among the two individual peoples.²

¹ Ys. IX. 19-21. Before each strophe the text regularly repeats the two first lines *a* and *b* of this strophe, but only with a variation in the number.

² Windischmann : *Ueber den Somacultus der Ariern*, “On the Soma-worship of the Arians” in the “Transactions of the Royal

A further duty of the priesthood, besides the offering of sacrifices and the consecration of the Hauma, was the maintenance of the holy fire.

In the house of every *Mazdayasna* there burned a never-ceasing fire. Its maintenance was regarded as a duty of the *pater-familias*.¹ It was the central and rallying point of all members of that family.

So, too, a continual fire seems to have been tended on the hearth of every chief of a community and every country prince. It was considered the centre of that community and of that country. It was to these political associations, what the hearth-fire was to the family.²

But there were, no doubt, in the early age of the Avesta different sacred fires instituted in certain places and tended by the priests. A description of these fires is given by Dr. Spiegel, chiefly on the authority of the *Bundehesh*.³

Academy of Science, Bavaria," 1847, pp. 127 seq.; Zimmer, *AiL*. pp. 272 seq.; Ludwig, *Einl.* pp. 376 seq.; Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. I. pp. 432 seq.

¹ *Vide* vol. I. pp. 74-76. Hence fire, too, bears in the Avesta the epithet *nmānō-paiti*. (*Cf.* Skr. *gr̥hapati*, *viçpati*, the epithets of Agni).

² *Cf.* Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 575. This usage is apparently very old. Quite analogous customs may be observed among the Greeks and Romans. All Phratries belonging to the community had at Athens their common hearths in the *Prytanēum*, the town-hall. But there was also a *χοινὴ ἑστία τῶν Ἀρχάδων* (*i.e.*, a common hearth or family-seat of the Arcadians) as well as a *ἑστία τῆς Μαχεδονικῆς βασιλείας* (hearth of the Macedonian kingdom). In Italy, too, every town had its own Vesta (*ἑστία*), for instance Lavinium, Alba Longa (*Albana Vesta*), Rome. It is also known to have been customary for colonists to take with them fire from the central hearth of the metropolis and to kindle with it the sacred fire in their new home.

³ Spiegel, *E.A.* vol. II. pp. 45-47; *cf.* *ZdmG.* vol. XXXIII. pp. 496-501, on the Fire Gushasp or Gushnasp.

It is certain that the Avesta priests performed their ceremonies before a burning fire. This fire was therefore addressed as present in the initiatory formulas, which invite the *yazatas* to the offerings: "We invite *thee*, O Fire, thou son of Ahura Mazda!"¹

Though the *Mazdayasna* had no proper temples, they had evidently consecrated fire-places,² where the sacred element was nourished and fostered by the priests.

The ceremonies prescribed for inferior modes of purification could be performed by laymen for themselves. In more important cases, however, such as the "purification of the nine nights," it was obligatory to call in a priest.³

The performance of the purificatory ceremonies seems to have been the chief source of revenue to the *Athravans*. Any exorbitant demand was here as impossible as in the case of medical treatment, which was, likewise, rendered by the priests.⁴

The Vendidad regulates the payment very accurately. It is greater or smaller according to rank and fortune. Only in the case of one priest having purified another was no payment received.

"A priest," says the Avesta,⁵ "shall be purified for his efficacious blessing; the chief of a country for a good male camel; the chief of a district for a stallion; the chief of a village for a bull; the chief of a family for a calf."

If it is possible, continues the text, the payment shall be made in cattle. Exceptionally only, some other kind of movable property may be given, as for instance food, clothes and trinkets.

¹ Ys. I. 12, *tava · āthrō · Ahurahē · Mazdāo · puthra*; likewise II. 42, III. 14, IV. 17.

² Perhaps *āthra* (see my *Handbuch*, *sub voce*); next, *dāitya · gātu*, Vd. VIII. 81 seq.

³ Cf. vol. I. pp. 82, 83.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 215, 218.

⁵ Vd. IX. 37 seq.

Laymen are enjoined to observe accurately this scale of rates. They shall take care that the priest leaves the house of the purified person contented and without any resentment. If he goes away angry, the purified person becomes impure anew and remains so for ever.

His garb itself distinguishes the priest by certain symbols which he must always carry.

He wears a *patidāna*, a mouth-band, with which he keeps his mouth covered during offerings, lest he might sully the sacred fire with his breath or saliva. He wears also the *khrafstraghna* and the *dagger*, two instruments which serve for killing impure animals. Finally, it is customary for the priest to hold a bunch of sacred twigs.¹

But the Avesta expressly states that even these external marks do not make the priest. Many a man feigned to be an Āthravan by assuming these badges unlawfully, probably with a view to profit.

Hence the warning of the Vendidād:—"Many a man wears the *patidāna* or the *khrafstraghna*, or holds the bunch of sacred twigs, or has the serpent-sting (or

¹ I refer here for comparison to the directions prescribed to the Brāhmans in the Code of Manu: "Fire he must always consider as sacred. He must not blow it out with his breath nor stamp on it. He must also not warm his feet at it, or place it in a pan under his bed or under his feet. He must not throw anything rotten into the fire. Offal, the remains of food, and water which has been used for a bath or a foot-bath, must be removed far away from the fire. Nor is the Brāhmaṇ allowed to throw any refuse into water, or pour any blood or drink into it, still less to spit into it. He must not look at his image reflected in the water, or drink water in the hollow of his hand. The clothes of the Brāhmaṇ must be always clean and white, and never worn by anybody else. . . . In his ears the Brāhmaṇ must wear very bright gold rings. He must wear a wreath on his head, and carry in the one hand a staff of bamboo, in the other *kuça*-grass and the water-pitcher for his ablutions." Duncker, *GdA.* vol. III. pp. 132, 133 (E. Abbott's edition, vol. IV. p. 173).

instrument for killing venomous creatures), without being invested according to the precepts of the religion, and fraudulently says he is an Āthravan."

"But do not call such a one an Āthravan, who spends the whole night and more time besides, without offering, without saying prayers, without reciting the holy sayings, without performing ceremonies, without teaching or being taught in order to gain (immortal) existence at the Chinvat-Bridge, and fraudulently says he is an Āthravan. Do not call him an Āthravan. Him rather thou shalt call an Āthravan, who meditates during the whole night and longer, who delivers one from anxiety and gives (*him*) joy at the Chinvat-Bridge, who gives (*him*) religious instruction, who makes (*him*) gain heaven and the piety and the bliss of Paradise."¹

Here the aim of the priesthood is evidently to make good their separation from the inferior orders. Every illegal encroachment upon their rights is punished with the greatest severity. Whoever performs the purificatory rites without a sufficient knowledge of the ritual shall, according to the Avesta, be punished with death.²

In the period from which dates the enactment of such regulations, the Āthravans must have formed themselves into an exclusive order, and ascribed to the priesthood a higher dignity than to other professions. Whoever did not belong to their guild, was not allowed to perform any priestly functions. Whoever nevertheless ventured to do so, had to undergo the severest punishment.

The priests do not seem to have had any fixed property in the country. It is expressly stated that they eat whatever food they can manage to obtain, and that they

¹ Vd. XVIII. 1-6 (leaving off a few words, particularly at the beginning). "To meditate" = *Khratūm · pares · ashavanem*, "to consult the pious mind."

² Vd. IX. 47, 49. See above, p. 39.

possess little wealth.¹ They lived on what they earned by medical practice and by performing purificatory ceremonies.²

As clearly appears, the Athravans were under a common head, who bore the title of *Zarathushtrotēma*, plainly derived from the name of the founder of the *Mazdayasnian* religion. The *Zarathushtrotēma* is mentioned along with the lord of the village, the president of the district, and the prince of the country. They all represent the executive political power,³ which possessed the highest spiritual and religious authority.

The attributes of the priest are chiefly of a spiritual kind. Whilst the warriors implore the divine beings to

¹ Vd. XIII. 45 : *paiti-qaretha · qarati . . . kasu-draona*.

² [In connection with the daily life of the Irānian priesthood, it would be interesting to quote the following extract from (Dr. West) chapter XLVI. of the *Dādistāni-dinik* : “ Is it allowable that those of the priesthood, when there is no daily livelihood for them from the life of the priesthood, should abandon the priesthood, and that other work be done, or not? The reply is this, that there is no loss of reputation to priests from priestly duties, which are themselves the acquired knowledge that is accumulated by the priestly disposition, care for the soul, and the requisite good works. And there is this advantage that, through acquaintance with the religion of the sacred beings, and certainty as to the reward of the spirit, they make them become more contented in adversity, more intelligent as regards stability of character in difficulty and restriction, and more through knowledge of the abode of hope for those saved. So that it is not fit they should abandon the priesthood, which is both harmless and an employment with advantages that has required much trouble to learn When they cannot obtain their livelihood, they are to seek it by agriculture, sheep-rearing, penmanship, or other proper employment among priests; and when it is not possible for them to live even by these, they are to seek it by bearing arms, hunting, or other proper employment in the profession of a virtuous warrior.” *Tr. n.*]

³ Ys. I. 6 ; cf. *vīsyā*, *zāntuma* and *dagyuma* in 3, 4, 5. In Visp. I. 9, the *Zarathushtrotēma* seems to be described as *āhuirish · dagyuma*.

grant them swift horses, victory in battle and in the chariot-race, the priests pray for wisdom.¹

But priestly science, comprising the understanding of the Holy Texts and of ritual observances, was imparted by means of religious instruction. The relation between teachers and disciples is not unfrequently referred to in the Avesta. I myself have alluded to it above.²

According to the respective functions which the priests discharged when offerings were made, they were divided into several sections. The priest who presided at the performance of the ceremony, was the *Zautar*. He had to recite the liturgy. The others took part in the sacred rites as his assistants.

In a later age a single priest, *Ratu* or *Raspi* performed the functions of the assisting priests. At first these various functions were allotted to each person separately. One priest crushed the Hauma-plant in a mortar; another tended the fire; a third had to bring the vessels required in the offering; a fourth had the special duty of fetching the water; a fifth cleansed the vessels; the sixth and seventh had no distinctive ceremonial functions assigned to them; apparently, it was their business to perform the purification and to hear the confession.³

¹ *Mastīm · jaidhyāoñti · spānemcha*, Yt. V. 86.

² Cf. vol. I. p. 58.

³ *Hāvanan* (from *hāvana*, "mortar," from the root *hu*=Skr. *su*); *ātare-vakhsha* (root *vakhsh*, "to grow, to wax, to increase"); *frabaretare* (root *bar* with *fra*); *ā-beretare*; *āsnatare* (root *snā*, "to wash, to bathe"); *rathwiskare*(?) and *sraoshā-varez*, Vsp. III. 4; Vd. V. 57. According to the former passage the Ratu alone performs all these functions.

§ 5. *Warriors and Peasants, Manufacturers and Slaves.*

Whilst the Avesta is rich in information as to the duties and rights of the priesthood, it tells us little concerning the other orders, which nevertheless formed, there cannot be the least doubt, by far the greater part of the people.

Besides the Āthravans, the Zoroastrian documents particularly mention the *Rathaeshtar*, the warriors, and the *Vāstrya-fshuyat*, the peasantry.¹

Neither the priesthood nor the profession of arms is mentioned in the Gāthās. The peasants, on the other hand, are frequently named under their official designation, for in that early period they made up the whole people. The priests formed as yet no separate order. There were, I am inclined to believe, only a few individuals who went from village to village as missionaries and preachers to propagate the new doctrine. But as yet there were no people who adopted the military profession without troubling themselves about agriculture. Every peasant was at the same time a fighting man, who was ready to defend his property against enemies in time of danger.

The warrior class may be regarded as a kind of rural gentry composed of the most opulent landlords, who could entrust to their servants the management of their estates and had, therefore, sufficient leisure to exercise themselves in the use of arms.

There is no doubt that every one who was capable of bearing arms, was bound to render military service. Nevertheless, not every Irānian who took the field was, therefore,

¹ The regular order is: *āthrvān*, *rathaeshtare*, *vāstrya-fshuyat*, Vd. V. 28, XIII. 44; Ys. XI. 6, XIII. 3; Vsp. III. 2; Yt. XIX. 7, and often.

ranked amongst the knights or champions. The latter evidently fought in battle on chariots, from which the whole order took its name.¹ Consequently, when a war broke out, it was the duty of the cavalier to provide himself with a chariot, while in time of peace it was necessary that he should exercise himself in fighting from the chariot.

The body of champions was, certainly, of special importance to the prince or sovereign. In them he had a number of warriors prepared to support him. In case of war, as soon as the enemy attacked the country, they were ready to follow him into the field. They were, I believe, likewise able to command great masses of the people, who could only in times of extreme danger exchange the plough for the sword and lance, while they were also useful in stimulating the courage of the army by their own example.

So it is probable that the sovereign mostly endeavoured to gain the knights or champions over to his party. They formed his retinue, even his constant attendants. In the neighbourhood of his mansion chivalrous feats and warlike exercises were diligently practised.

Thus arose gradually a military nobility who, besides their larger estates, acquired a privileged social position. Several personages are called "champions" in the Avesta. Such a one is Tūsa, the conqueror of the equestrian tribe of the Hunus. Seated on horseback, he prays to the Anāhita for strength to his team and for victory over his

¹ *Rathaeshtare* or *rathaeshṭāo* comes from the locative *rathae* and root *stā*; hence "standing on the chariot." In Sanskrit it corresponds to *ratheshṭha* and *ratheshṭhā*, which, however, do not signify any profession. [Vide Professor Max Duncker's History of Antiquity, Abbott's edition, vol. V. p. 186: "That a warlike nobility of a highly important and pre-eminent character, attitude, and position, existed in Eastern Irān is the less to be doubted, as the order of warriors in the Avesta is denoted by a name (*rathaeshtar*) which goes back to the chariots of war." Tr. n.]

enemies. With a similar prayer do the champions generally address themselves to Mithra.¹

Mithra himself is often styled a champion or chariot-warrior. He drives his horses along the heavens and takes part in battles. Srausha is similarly represented. Fire, too, as being the powerful element fighting in tempests, is called a warrior.²

It is self-evident that the number of the champions was limited. Probably there were few large estates in Eastern Irān. The fertile soil, broken up as it was in most districts, did not at all allow of the formation of large estates. On the contrary, the land was, as it were by nature, divided into a great number of small farms.

Small farmers were certainly more numerous, and comprised the greatest portion of the people. And it is for this reason alone that we learn nothing particular as regards this class as such, its political organization, duties, and rights, whereas its occupation, viz., the breeding of cattle and the tilling of the soil has already been discussed. Only occasionally does the Avesta speak of industry and labour, as well as early rising, as characteristics of the farmer.³

We must enter more into detail in discussing the question whether there existed an order of manufacturers, and what their social position was in the Avesta State.

The division of the people into priests, warriors, and farmers is frequently met with in the Avesta. This

¹ Yt. V. 53, X. 11.; cf. vol I. pp. 176, 177. Titles of honour conferred on the *rathaeshāo* are: *takhma* (Yt. V. 86) and *aurvat* (Ys. IX. 22; Yt. V. 85). As attributes of the warrior the following are mentioned in Vd. XIII. 45: (1) *rapī- paurvāeibyō*; (2) *aipi-jatō- gām- hudhaoghem*; (3) *parō- pascha- nmānahē*.

² Yt. X. 25, 102, 112; Yt. XI. 19; Ys. LVII. 34; Nyāj. V. 6; Sir. I. 9; Ys. LXII. 8.

³ Vd. XIII. 46: *Zaēnaḡha- evistō-qafna- yatha- vāstryō-fshuyās, parō- pascha- nmānahē- yatha- vāstryō-fshuyās, pascha- parō- nmānahē- yatha- vāstryō-fshuyās.*

threefold classification is so firmly established that we cannot possibly suppose the existence of a fourth order possessing *equal rights*.

Only from a single passage of the Yasna might we be tempted to draw another conclusion. But I believe that this passage only apparently contradicts the other statements of the Avesta. Along with the names of the priests, warriors, and farmers it also mentions a fourth class, that of the *Hūti*, which term cannot but mean "manufacturer."¹

Yet the passage does not contain a single syllable concerning the political or social position of the four estates with regard to each other. It treats merely of the nature of different callings and occupations; consequently, we are not entitled to conclude that the *Hūti* were classed together with the other orders. The passage does not at all touch upon this question. However, the contrary is proved by the continual and official threefold division of the Avesta mentioned in other passages.

So we are only at liberty to infer from this passage of the Yasna that manufactures were not confined to domestic industry, but were carried on by a particular class of the population. This hypothesis has already been stated in another part of this work, and it is suggested to us by

¹ Ys. XIX. 17. *Kāish · pishtrāish? Athrava, rathaeshthāo, vāstryō-fshuyās, hūtish*, "what are the *pishtras*? The priest, the warrior, the farmer, the manufacturer." We must lay some stress upon the word *pishtra*. It cannot, I believe, mean "order" in its judicial or political sense, but perhaps "skilfulness, calling" (from root *pis* = Skr. *piç*, "to make skilful"). Tradition explains the word *hūti* by *hūtukhsh* (*cf.* Mod. Pers. *takhshā*), Sanskrit *prakrtikarman*. In later times this fourfold classification is naturally employed in all passages. When manufactures began to thrive, the order of manufacturers gained respect and dignity. Cf. *Mkh.* chap. XXXII. 2; LIX. 1-10. Yet it is characteristic that in the Minokhired too, "misbelief," *dush-garōishni*, is called *āhō*, the special sin of the *hūtukhshā* (Dr. West, *Mkh.* Glossary s. v.).

the variety and the comparatively high perfection of the arts, which, according to the Avesta, existed in ancient Irān.¹

Furthermore, we may conclude that the manufacturers were not a subdivision of the third order. Such a supposition ought to be founded on substantial grounds. The title given to the peasantry exclusively regards the two functions of the farmer, viz., agriculture and cattle-breeding. No other function is at all presupposed.

So there remains only a *single* possible theory, namely, that besides the fully authorized members of the Avesta commonwealth, divided into priests, warriors, and farmers, there existed also an inferior section of the population, consisting of handicraftsmen.²

It cannot be stated whether this section was servile or semi-servile, or whether its members were personally independent but without any political *status*.

It is not improbable that it was composed of the remnants of the aboriginal population of Irān, which had submitted to the immigrating Arians. The conquered race remained in a kind of dependence. Yet it is certain that the ancient hostility gradually died out, and that they were, as early as in the Avesta epoch, thoroughly peaceful. Perhaps the subjugated people were admitted, at least partially, into the community of the Mazdayasna, but without being allowed any political rights.

As was customary in those times, all the landed property was claimed by the immigrating conquerors. However, the less honourable occupations of handicraft were left to the vanquished race.

But if it be true that the primitive population of Irān belonged to the so-called Tūrānian race, which inhabited

¹ *Vide* vol. I. p. 212.

² Amongst the Indians the order of Vaīyas, too, comprised husbandmen, merchants, and artisans.

Mesopotamia before the immigration of the Semites, we may understand why objects made of metal are especially described as various and ingenious by the Avesta. In the original home of the Tūrānians, among the slopes of the Altai mountains, where metals are found in abundance, and near the surface of the soil, that people had acquired in the most ancient times the arts of the miner, founder, and goldsmith, and had subsequently spread further and further in their wanderings to the South-West.¹

We can also imagine that the conquered aborigines were deprived of their personal liberty. In that case they formed or made up at least the main portion of the servile population. In that period, as in ancient Rome, manufactures may have been carried on by slaves.

There is hardly any doubt that in the Avesta State there existed a servile class, since it is known that every free-man might pawn away his freedom.²

But the principal increase in the number of slaves was, I suppose, effected by the numerous wars waged by the Avesta people. Captives taken in war were kept by their conquerors as servants and slaves. As such they formed, I believe, part of the household of the Mazdayasna, where they seem to have been treated kindly and humanely.

The wives and daughters of the conquered enemies were likewise a desirable prize. As menials in the houses of their conquerors, they very often knew how to gain the love of their masters through their beauty and wanton ways. They were, I believe, the *Fahika*, against whom the Avesta so emphatically warns the faithful.³

¹ Rawlinson, "The Five Great Monarchies," vol. I. pp. 98-99 ; Maspero, *Gdm V.* p. 137.

² See above, pp. 37-38

³ Cf. Vd. XIII. 46, 48 ; Yt. XVII. 57-58.

Identical customs existed among the Vedic Indians. By *Dāsa*, the name applied to the aboriginal population of the Panjāb, are also meant slaves. This proves that the two notions really coincide, and that the Dāsas, falling into the hands of the Arians, were kept and employed as slaves.¹ So, too, if the Rig-veda expressly recognizes in the Dāsa-women dangerous enemies of the Arians, this fact must be founded, I imagine, on grounds similar to those which called for the admonition of the Avesta against wanton women.²

The term by which the Avesta actually designates, though only in two passages, the servile class, is *Vaisu*.³

The *Vaisu*, as it seems, ranked in the family between women and little children. For the purification of one of them the fee to the priest was an animal (a beast of burden) fit for carrying burdens. Thus slaves were evidently regarded as members of the family and their possession very highly valued. They might likewise be admitted into the religious community, and were subject to the ritual laws of the Avesta. But the *Vaisu* bore at the same time an appellation, which doubtless indicates in my opinion his menial character.⁴

In another passage the *Vaisu* is called "amusing" or "making music." So the servants had apparently the duty of diverting and amusing their masters by their arts. The very same epithets are also applied to the "wanton women,"

¹ Zimmer, *AiL*. pp. 107 seq. See also Grassmann, *Wib.* s.v. *dāsa*, 3rd meaning.

² Rv. 2. 20. 7; 3. 20. 10.

³ *Vaesu* from *vis*, "to go to meet, to serve." Its connection with Sanskrit *vaicya* is not certain.

⁴ Vd. IX. 38. *Pairi-aetaru* comes from root *i* with *pairi*, "to go about, to serve." Also Sanskrit *paryeti*, "one who has got something in his power," may be referred to for comparison. So we might, perhaps, translate *pairi-aetaru* in its passive sense, "being in the power of, belonging to."

and this very fact induces me to believe that the latter were also slaves in the house of the Mazdayasna.¹

In order to give the reader a better notion of the social position of the Vaisu, I may perhaps refer to that of the *Cudra* in the Brāhmanic commonwealth. They were compelled to render personal service to Brāhmans, Kshatriya and Vaīcya. So they were, like the Vaisu, a menial class. Nevertheless they—we suppose the Vaisu also—were allowed to work and earn their livelihood as artisans.

Here they may be compared to the Lūris dwelling in Baloochistān Proper. They are, according to the description of M. Bellew,² a kind of gipsies. In small parties formed of a couple of families they are met with throughout the whole country. They do not belong to the race of the Brahuis or the Baloochees. They have no landed property, nor do they cultivate the fields of others. They are partly vagrant musicians wandering from one village to another, and partly engaged in humble industries, such as pottery, rope-making and mat-making.

It would be an anachronism to regard the Vaisus and the Lūris as perfectly identical. The latter, according to an account of the *Shāh-nāme*, were induced by Behrāmgūr or Varāhrān V. (Vullers, pp. 417-438) to emigrate from India to Irān. Nor can they be called slaves, since they personally remained totally free and independent.

¹ Vd. XIII. 46: *qandrakara*, "making music" or "merry-making" = Phlv. *khunāk-kar* = Mod. Pers. *khunyā-gar*. Other common appellations of the Vaisu and Jahika are: *asnaeræsha* ("causing damage by any close contact (?)"), *zairimyafsman* and *thryafsman*, the meanings of which are very obscure.

² "From the Indus to the Tigris," p. 52. Cf. Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 550 note.

§ 6. *The Mutual Relations of the several Orders.*

Tradition traces the institution of separate orders to Zarathushtra.¹ He is not merely the founder of the Parsi Religion; succeeding generations revere him at the same

¹ [Comp. Spiegel, *Eränische Alterthumskunde*, vol. III. pp. 554 seq.—“Just as in India the *Purushasúkta* endeavours to explain the descent of castes, so do we find also in Irän legendary statements concerning the origin of the different orders, which they ascribe to the most early period. According to the *Book of Kings*, Yima organized the different orders; and this assumption is also quite reasonable, for as Yima was, according to the Iränian legend, the founder of the political organization, he ought naturally to have been also the author of the social classification. On the other hand, according to the view of the priests, Zarathushtra was the first founder of the three estates, which were after him continued by his sons. It is extremely difficult to reconcile these two accounts with one another, for, according to the legend, Zarathushtra appears only in times far distant from the age of Yima, i.e., under Vishtāspa, and we cannot believe that the Iränian state could have existed thousands of years without a division into classes having taken place. The difficulty may be explained if we may assume that Zarathushtra lived in the age of Yima, and that with his help Yima organized the state; and some passages may be adduced as an indirect proof of this statement. The *Book of Kings* speaks not merely of the fire altar but also of the Avesta as in existence long before Zarathushtra. It must, likewise, strike us when it is said in Vd. II. 143 that Urvatatnara, the son of Zarathushtra, was King in the Vara of Yima, for it is strange indeed that this Vara of Yima should have remained without a chief until the time of King Vishtāspa. However, the assumption that Zarathushtra lived in the reign of Yima is very inconvenient, since in that case we must not only destroy the entire sacred chronology, but also separate Zarathushtra from Vishtāspa, with whom he is nevertheless coupled in the Avesta. A second and less violent expedient is to ascribe a distinct origin to the priestly legend eliminated by us in vol. I. p. 659, so that

time, as the author of the most important political institutions. The Avesta, therefore, calls him the first Priest, the first King, and the first Agriculturist.¹

According to the Bundehesh, Zarathushtra had three sons, who are, likewise, mentioned in the Avesta; they are called *Isatvāstra*, *Hvarchithra*, *Urvatatnara*. The first was the head of the priests. To him are ascribed the foundation and organization of the priesthood. The second was the commander-in-chief in war. The third was the chief of the agricultural population.²

Firdūsī also hands down a legend concerning the origin of the orders, which is traced back to the days of Yima. I do not think it necessary to endeavour to reconcile this legend with the narrative of the Avesta and of the Bundehesh;³ for we have here to deal merely with a legend, which can, and will, at all times spread, develop, and change with great freedom. And it is perfectly clear why a poet like Firdūsī should give the legend a character different from what we find in the theological books, such as the Avesta and the Bundehesh.

It is the purpose of the legend, to give to some important institution the character of high antiquity, no matter whether

Yima on the one side, and Vishtāspa and Zarathushtra on the other, ran parallel and were blended together, in a later period only, in the manner now current.

The result at which we finally arrive (*after minute research*) is this, that the rise of the civilization of the Irānians is related in two different narratives; while the one traces it to Yima, according to the other Zarathushtra is said to be its pioneer. If doubts exist as to the author of that civilization, there is even greater difficulty in determining the region in which, from the Irānian point of view, it had its origin." *Tr. n.]*

¹ Yt. XIII. 88-89 : *paoiryāi · athaurunē*, *paoiryāi · rathaeshthāi*, *paoiryāi · vāstryāi · fshuyañtē*.

² *Bdh.* chap. XXXIII. 5 ; West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 142.

³ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. pp. 549-550.

it names Zarathushtra or his sons, or even the ancient Yima as its founder.

The passage in Firdūsī runs as follows :¹—

“ Of all who pursued the same trade,² Jemshīd convoked an assembly, to which he devoted fifty years.”

“ First the tribe³ called Kātuziyān (or Āmōziyān).⁴ Know that these are devoted to the observance of public worship.”

“ He separated them from the rest of the people and gave them the mountains as their dwelling-place.

“ In order to live there in adoration and meditation before the Bright Lord of the Universe.

“ In the second place he set those who are named *Nīsāriyān*.

“ They are those who fight with the courage of the lion; who shine before the army and the countries.

“ Who shelter the throne of the King and maintain the glory of virtue.

“ The third, know ye, bears the name *Nāsūdi*. To nobody have they to pay homage.⁵

“ Blameless they work and sow and reap and nourish themselves.

“ They need not obey anybody, though their garments are poor (*i.e.*, they are meanly clad); and their ears are free from the sound of calumny.

¹ *Shāh-nāme*, ed. Vullers, vol. I. p. 24, ll. 17 seq. Cf. Mohl, *Le Livre des Rois* (“The Book of Kings”), vol. I. pp. 34 seq.

² The original text has *peshah*, corresponding to the Avesta *pishtra* (*vide* p. 62).

³ Firdūsī uses the word *guroh* “calerva, horde, crowd”; so too further below.

⁴ Mohl’s edition has *āmōziyān*. The word comes from *āmōkhlan*, “to teach.”

⁵ Mohl: “They pay no homage to any person.” Vullers (*Lexicon*, s.v. *sipās*):—“*quibus nemo gratias agit*,” “whom nobody thanks.”

"They are free, and the cultivation of the earth is their charge; they know neither enemies nor lawsuits.

"For a wise and noble-minded man says: *Laziness makes the free man a slave.*

"The fourth order comprises those who are called the *Ahnūkhushi*;¹ they are active for gain, and full of arrogance.

"Their business is to manufacture; their soul is continually full of fear."

The tradition of the *Shāh-nāme* entirely agrees with the views of the Avesta. It distinguishes four orders, just as the passage of the Yasna often referred to above. The independence of the farmers and the enjoyment in their profession of rights equal to those of the priests and warriors, are specially emphasized. However, the inferiority of the fourth order no less plainly appears. There is no doubt but handicrafts are regarded as less honourable; those who follow them are considered as not free and morally inferior.

Let us now set aside the fourth order and consider the mutual relations which subsisted between the priests, warriors, and farmers. The first question, no doubt, is:— Whether we have here before us *castes* or *orders*?

Two things are characteristic of and essential to the existence of caste.² Wherever these are wanting, we cannot speak of castes, but only of orders.

Firstly, the caste must be hereditary, from father to son, in strict conformity to law. The order is fixed and determined by birth. It is possible that one may sink into a

¹ This name is full of interest. Evidently it is identical with the Pahlavi *ahunvakhshī*...[The Persian word *ahnūkhushi* (*ahuna-vakhshi*) is, I believe, corrupted from the Pahlavi *hutokhshi* (from *hu*, "good," and *thwakhsh*, "to endeavour") industry, artizanship, the profession of artizans. To my knowledge the word *ahunvakhshi* rarely occurs in Pahlavi. *Tr. n.*]

² Cf. Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 551.

lower caste, while it is impossible for him to rise to a higher grade.

Secondly, a lawful intermarriage between members of different castes cannot take place. Whenever such a marriage is contracted, it is either regarded only as concubinage, or the children are assigned to the lower caste; nay, perhaps, to the very lowest in the scale.

I know no passage of the Avesta or of the late traditional writings, which bears testimony to the existence of both these characteristics in the orders of the Avesta. However, this silence is not in itself conclusive.

But various reasons, chiefly intrinsic ones, disprove the existence of real castes in ancient Irān. I refer to the words of Dr. Spiegel, who has already demonstrated this fact in a convincing manner:¹

"We regard the caste as a luxury, which can only be allowed in opulent countries. Castes are definitely proved to exist only in countries such as India and Egypt, where their existence may be easily conceived.² These two

¹ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. pp. 546 seq.

² The subject treated of here is closely connected with the question whether the Arians of the Rig-veda had any castes among them. Whilst Ludwig (*Einleitung*, pp. 216 seq.), agreeing with Haug and Kern, affirms it, it is denied by Zimmer (*AiL*. pp. 186 seq.), Aufrecht, Benfey, Muir, M. Müller, Roth, and Weber. I am also of opinion that the existence of castes is inconceivable in the times and circumstances of the Rig-veda. Without any regard to other reasons I should rely principally on an argument which, as far as I know, has not yet been advanced. There cannot be any doubt that castes can only be found in a complete and settled commonwealth, in which alone the necessary control could be exercised, and suitable and effective measures taken against any violation of the laws of caste. Even in our days the caste-system in India gives rise to most of the lawsuits. However, the views of the people are to a great extent humanized by English influence. What a complicated judicial system must have existed in the Vedic antiquity! A commonwealth so

countries are extremely fertile and rich in natural productions. The farmer in particular can derive from the cultivation of a relatively small piece of ground whatever he requires for the maintenance of himself and his family; hence he can afford to distribute the surplus among those who serve him in various ways. The above-mentioned countries have also a very genial climate, which enables their inhabitants to be contented with little; for their living and clothing cost but little in comparison with what is necessary in less favoured climates. Wherever such facilities for earning a livelihood exist, castes, in my opinion, must naturally be formed."

But all these circumstances, which favour or facilitate the rise and development of castes, are not at all to be met with in Irān. Here the soil is on the whole supposed to be extremely poor. In many parts it can be used only for pasture; and, wherever agriculture is possible, it requires most careful cultivation, much labour and diligence.

The climate is anything but genial. It is a continental climate in the full sense of the word, varying between the extremes of heat and cold. Any restriction to a particular kind of vocation is out of the question. Otherwise, the people would soon feel the effects of famine. In Irān every one must work according to his strength and ability and without any long relaxation in order to make a living.

The Athravans, perhaps, form a solitary exception. Yet, even regarding them, it is uncertain whether they had no

organized no doubt existed in the Brahmana in the valley of the Ganges. Yet the Arians of the Indus and of the Panjāb did not possess it, since they had no settled home, but were in course of migration from West to East. Under such varying circumstances there could not rise and take deep root an institution which, more than any other, bears the stamp of stability, solidity, and ossification, and which, no doubt, presupposes a development of centuries before it can be regarded as permanent.

other sources of income than the exercise of their priestly functions.

If the orders of priests, warriors, and farmers had been castes, there would certainly have been invented some myth representing this division as eternal and ordained by God. Brāhmanical legends of such a kind are not wanting. But it is actually a priestly tradition which describes the three orders as being of one nature and one kind. Indeed, the Avesta derives all the three orders from Zarathushtra, whereby they are bound together rather than sundered.

The mutual blending of the orders can even be proved, I believe, from the Avesta itself.

It is expressly said that Hauma refuses to women who do not render him due honour, the birth of an Āthravan, and, generally, a happy delivery.¹ Here we must suppose that the son of every woman, at least in theory, could become a priest. It was certainly the eager desire of all women in ancient Irān to be blessed with sons who might participate in this high honour.

The same idea is implied in a curse which is pronounced against the despisers of Hauma. “In such a house (*where Hauma is despised*) no Āthravan shall be born, nor warrior, nor farmer.”²

It is thus proved that not even the Āthravans formed a caste properly so called. Yet there cannot be any doubt that in course of time they constituted themselves a class distinct from the other orders. It must have gradually

¹ Ys. X. 15: *noit · tām · āthravō · puthrīm * naēdha · dasti · huputhrīm.*

² Ys. XI. 6. The passage might also be construed as follows: “In the house of a priest (*where Hauma is despised*) shall be born no priest (*i.e.*, no son at all), in the house of a warrior no warrior, in that of a farmer no farmer.” Yet this translation seems rather strained. A much stronger expression is used in the passage addressed to every man of the tribe: “The despiser of Hauma shall have no free son at all.”

become a recognized rule that only the sons of priests should be ordained as priests. At least such had naturally a preferential claim to this privileged rank.

We know how jealously the Āthravans watched that no one, who was not entitled, should enter their circle and assume their rights. So they formed at all events a well-organized order, and admission into it was subject to certain conditions.

Among the Modern Parsis the sacerdotal dignity is inherited from father to son. A layman cannot acquire it. A priest, on the contrary, is free to embrace another calling.¹ Thus usage has become established in course of time and has acquired the force of law.

The priesthood held generally an isolated position among the Avesta people and in the commonwealth.

I really believe that the Āthravans were not properly natives of Eastern Irān.² They had their principal seat in Media whence they emigrated to the East. It was by

¹ Dosabhoy Framji: "The Parsis," p. 227; ("History of the Parsis," 2nd ed. vol. II. p. 235): "The priest does not acquire his position from sacerdotal fitness or superior learning. Strictly speaking he cannot be called a spiritual guide. The son of a priest is also a priest, unless he chooses to follow another profession, which is not prohibited to him. But a layman cannot be a priest. They resemble the Levites"; and p. 237: "The present 'dasturs,' or chief priests, among the Parsis in Bombay, namely, Dastur Peshotanji, the successor of the learned and renowned Edaldaru (Sanjana), and Dastur Jamaspji, successor of the well-known Edaldaru Jamaspasana, are intelligent and well-informed men, possessing a considerable knowledge of their religion; but some of the priesthood are profoundly ignorant of its first principles. As the minds of the Parsi people have now been awakened, and as active measures have been and are being devised for improvement, the darkness and gloom of the past will doubtless be succeeded by a bright dawn in the future." Cf. Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 567, note 3.

² Cf. Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. pp. 554 seq., pp. 561-567.

such emigrant priests that the doctrine of Zarathushtra was announced to the people of Balkh, Merv, and Herāt, of Soghd and Khvarizm, of Seistan and Kābul.

This opinion is strongly confirmed by what is stated in the Parsi legend regarding Zoroaster. It represents the Prophet as coming from Rai or Ragha to Balkh, to the court of King Vishtāspa, and preaching there the new faith.

I will not deny that this legend is extremely imperfect. However, it is utterly impossible to believe that this tradition should have no foundation in fact. We do not gain anything whatever by rejecting tradition as mere nonsense and absurdity. Such an assertion must not be maintained without convincing reasons. It is our task to extract the kernel of truth contained in traditions but hidden under a mass of legend and poetry ! If we act otherwise, we, indeed, destroy the old edifice of tradition, only to raise in its place another which stands on no foundation whatever.

If we eliminate from the Zoroastrian legend the royal court of Vishtāspa and the kingly palaces ; if we lay aside the learned disputations and the intrigues of the court ; nay more, the very name of Zarathushtra, as being the only historical personage, I should have no objection to offer. However, this fact must, I believe, remain—as being the nucleus and basis of the entire legend—that the Avesta religion was introduced among the Eastern Irānians from the West, and that it was brought to them by the order of priests immigrating from the West.

It even seems that only a small portion of that priesthood had settled in Eastern Irān. The majority wandered about homeless like the Jewish Levites and the Mohammedan *Mollahs*. They taught and preached and earned their living by occasionally performing their medical or sacerdotal functions in cases of disease or impurity.

The “coming of the Āthravans” is celebrated in the Avesta. They come from afar bringing piety into the

countries.¹ Before they immigrated from their distant home into Eastern Irān piety had not dwelt there, but a creed different from that which is taught by the Avesta. The people still followed the old Arian religion of nature.

The same fact is implied in the tradition which puts into the mouth of Kersāni the words:—"No more shall an Āthravan come into my country to make proselytes!"² Kersāni is apparently a legendary prince, who counteracts the missionary work of the Āthravans. It is further on related that Hauma vanquished him and deprived him of his power. This evidently means that the priests succeeded through divine aid in breaking the resistance of that prince and in gaining over his people to their new doctrine.

That the priests in the very epoch of the Avesta were still in an unsettled condition and wandered through the country, may perhaps be inferred from their appellation, "wandering through the countries," by which, it seems, the Āthravans are designated in the texts.³

In Ragha, that is in Media, the Āthravans had their home. Here resided the *Zarathushtōtema*, and hence the priests had evidently emigrated to the East. In Ragha they had not only spiritual but even secular power.

This is confirmed by the Avesta, according to which there were generally five chiefs. The first is the master of the house, the second the headman of the village, the third the head of the tribe, and the fourth the prince of the country. The fifth is the *Zarathustra* or the *Zarathush-trōtema*, the chief of the Āthravans, who was, at least according to the notions of the priests, above all secular potentates.

¹ Ys. XLII. 6; *athaurunām · paiti-ajāthrem · yazamaidē · yōi iēā* (? *ayā*) · *dūrāt* · *ashō-ishō* · *daqyunām*.

² Ys. IX. 24; *nōit · mē · apām · āthrava · aiwishtish · vercdhyē · dānhava · charāt*.

³ *Dānhāurvaesa*, Vsp. III. 3; Gāh. IV. 8; Yt. XXIV. 17.

Ragha affords the only exception. Here there are but four chiefs; the fourth is the *Zarathushtra*. Thus in Media he unites the spiritual and secular power in his own person. He is not only the chief of the clergy, but at the same time also a country-prince in Ragha.¹

Hence we may infer that the Āthravans came from Media, where they had their permanent abode. Their chief resided in the ancient metropolis of the country.

Under such circumstances it must be admitted that the supposition that the Āthravans were identical with the Magi, in so far as they had spread over Eastern Irān, is very natural. It is not strange, that they received in the new country a different title from that which they had in their native land and in Persia. At all events, what we know about the Magi perfectly agrees with what is related of the Āthravans. It is uncertain whether the designation *Magu* (used elsewhere) occurs in the Avesta; yet it is not altogether improbable.²

¹ The passage (Ys. XIX. 18) is treated at full length by Spiegel, *E. A.* vol. III. p. 563. I cannot but agree entirely with his opinion. The original text runs:—*Kaya · ratavō? Nmānyō, visyō, zañtumō, zarathushtrō · pukhdhō; āvīhām · dagyunām · yāo · anyāo · rajōit · zarathushtroit. Chathru-ratush · Ragha · zarathush-trish; kaya · añhāo ratavō? Nmānyascha · visyascha · zañtumascha, zarathushtrō · tuiroyō.* “Who are the chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the prince of the country, the fifth is the Zarathushtra. (So it is) in the countries outside the Zarathushtrian Empire (?). The Zarathushtrian Ragha has four chiefs. Who are these chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the fourth is the Zarathushtra.” I observe that the tradition renders the word *zarathushtra* simply by *zartushtrum*. The change of the word *rajoit* into *raghoit*, is not obvious. The form of it would be objectionable even now.

² In Ys. LXV. 6, the term *mogu-thish* is found along with other designations of the adversaries of the Zoroastrian religion. It is often, and I believe not without some reason, translated “ hating the Magi.” Certainly everybody will admit that nothing is

There is no doubt that the Magi were a Median tribe.¹ Yet we know that they had spread also over Persia. Here they formed the priesthood, which, as regards customs and usages, greatly differed from the rest of the people. Hence Herodotus expressly distinguishes them from the Persians.²

We can only correctly understand the rebellion of the pseudo-Bardija, whom Darius calls one of the Magi, if we look upon it as a reaction of the Median tribe against the ascendancy of the Persians.³

Ammianus Marcellinus, too, speaks of Media in a manner worthy of credence, as the native country of the Magi. Here lay their fertile lands and fields, whence they departed to consecrate themselves for centuries exclusively to the worship of the divinities. It is particularly related that they maintained the eternal fires, which were originally kindled from a holy flame that had once fallen from heaven.

Finally, I must refer to a passage in Yāqūt alluded to by Dr. Spiegel, according to which the last chief of the Magi died in the fortress of Ushtunāvend near Rai. His residence was, therefore, near that primeval Ragha, wherein also the Avesta places the seat of the chief of the Āthravans.

We can now understand the nature and origin of the civilization of the Avesta people. It does not occur to me to locate their scene of activity in Western Irān, especially in Media. Some portion of the people, it is true, dwelt, according to the Avesta, on Median soil, but the majority, no doubt, had their home in Eastern Irān.

essentially proved or refuted by the droll remark: "the little word *maghu* or *moghu* has quite innocently incurred the suspicion of magic." (*ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 715, note).

¹ Herod. I. 101.

² Herod. I. 104.

³ Spiegel, *E. A.* vol II. pp. 304 seq.

However, Media was apparently not only the starting-point for the propagation of a new belief, but also for the spread of a new culture. The Āthravans during their missionary labours not only introduced their religion into the East, but also their civilization. And thus we can conceive why in the Avesta a social amelioration is combined with the religious reform. *

The civilization of Media may have been in many respects superior to that of the East. There the nature of the soil is by far more favourable to agriculture and permanent settlements, and not such as to necessitate a nomadic life.

We need not suppose that the Āthravans were entirely strangers to the inhabitants of Eastern Irān as regards their customs and language. I believe they belonged to those Irānian tribes, which had advanced furthest to the West; but, having been separated locally from their tribal brethren, and living under particular conditions of soil and climate, they had developed independently.

Naturally, the Āthravans first attached themselves in Eastern Irān to that portion of the people which most resembled them in culture and civilization. They sought and found their first support among those tribes that had already been accustomed, more or less, to the cultivation of the soil as well as to settled dwellings.

Starting from this centre they endeavoured to extend their civilizing influence also among the wild and independent tribes. And, indeed, their doctrine, pervaded by pious zeal, was useful also for practical purposes, so that it was calculated more than any other religion to mitigate the ruggedness of the country and of its people.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA.*

General Remarks.

IN writing my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians in Ancient Times," I did not devote a separate section to the question respecting the home and age of the Avesta. I believed that the list of geographical names occurring in the Avesta would suffice to show its Eastern Irānian origin, and that a description of the state of civilization it depicts would be enough to prove its great antiquity.

I have since been charged by my reviewers—with the exception of the criticism of M. Tomaschek, (*Ausland*, 1883, No. 42)—with over-estimating the age of the Avesta, and disregarding the important arguments in favour of its Median origin. I am, therefore, compelled to go more fully into the subject, in order to justify the view I have adopted. I shall begin with the two following statements:—

- (1) The country in which the civilization of the Avesta people took its rise, was really Eastern Irān.
- (2) It is a civilization of great antiquity, and dates back at least to a time antecedent to the Median and Persian kings.

I shall now make it my task separately to verify these two statements, and meet the arguments adduced on the opposite side.¹ I shall also endeavour not to overlook any

* This treatise, entitled *Vaterland und Zeitalter des Awestā und seiner Kultur*, was suggested to Dr. Geiger by Prof. Kuhn, and was first published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Vgl. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 3rd May 1884.

¹ I shall make use of the following abbreviations in quoting from writers to whom I shall have to refer often:—

of those arguments, claiming at the same time similar attention to all the reasons I may bring forward on my own side.

A few preliminary remarks before I begin—

1. The expression, "Home of the Avesta," is not quite precise. It may be asked whether it is meant to denote the territorial extent of Zoroastrianism and the home of the Avesta people, or the province to which the Avesta owes its origin. I take the expression in the former sense; for it is not evident whether the Avesta was originally composed in Sogdiana, Merv, or Ragha.¹ Even if we were to identify the home of Zarathushtra, the place where the Avesta was written would still remain uncertain. The question as to whether we can at all speak of an Eastern Irānian civilization is more practical. The difficulty lies in discovering whether the territory occupied by the Arians of the Avesta differed from that held by the Medes and Persians in historical times.

2. As regards the age of the Avesta, we cannot merely speak of it as "over-estimated." (J. I. Sp. 1477). The

1 Sp. 1. For Spiegel, *Vishtāçpa oder Hystaspes und das Reich der Baktrer*; *Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift*. vol. VIII. pp. 1 seq.

2 Sp. 2. For Spiegel, *Ueber das Vaterland und das Zeitalter des Awestā*; *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. XXXV. 1881, pp. 629 seq.

3 J. 1. For Justi's Review of my *Ostirān. Kultur*, "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians"; *Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 25th November 1882, No. 47.

4 H. 1. For C. de Harlez, *Avesta traduit*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1881; especially the "Introduction."

5 H. 2. For C. de Harlez, *Le calendrier Persan et le pays origininaire du Zoroastrianisme*; *Bulletin de l'Athénée Oriental*, 1881, pp. 79-97, 159-183.

6 H. 3. For C. de Harlez, Review of my *Ostirānische Kultur im Alterthume*; *ibid*, 1883, pp. 217-225.

7 H. 4. For C. de Harlez, *Origine de l'Avesta et son interprétation*; *Le Muséon*, vol. I. 1882, pp. 494-505.

¹ I shall speak especially of Ragha at greater length further on.

question is simply this:—Is the Avesta of greater antiquity than Medo-Persian history? Is it of more recent date, or contemporary with it?

3. Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 2. pp. 639-640; cf. also Sp. 1. p. 11) says:¹ “Now, as regards the theory of a Bactrian origin for the Avesta, only indirect proofs can be brought in support of it, for once only is Bactria directly mentioned by name.” Again, Prof. C. de Harlez, (H. 1. p. xlv.): “*On affirme généralement que ce* (i.e. the home of the Avesta) *fut Bactriane.*” For my own part, as I have suggested in my first remark, I do not believe that the Bactrian country was the special home of the Avesta. I am much more inclined to be guided by the general contrast between Eastern and Western Irān, which appears to me inherent in the nature of the country, and which is so prominent a feature to this day in Persian history.

4. Finally, let me observe that, naturally, I do not look on the Avesta as it now exists as identical with the original Avesta. I entirely agree with Dr. Spiegel, who says (Sp. 2. 638):—“Our Avesta is a prayer-book abridged from the great Avesta for liturgical purposes.”² But what conclusion must we draw from this? Probably no more than that the Avesta, as we have it, is incomplete, and has even in many instances undergone much alteration; nevertheless its substance is entirely derived from the original. However, it is by no means certain, (though not impossible, or rather very probable, and in some cases evident), that in the compilation of this “Manual of Liturgy,” much was inserted in the text [*as mere explicative words or commentary*]. In order to distinguish the matter inserted we must discover certain signs. Let me point out some of

¹ *Was nun die Entstehung des Awestā in Baktrien betrifft, so wird man dafür zumeist nur indirekte Beweise finden müssen, denn direkt wird Baktra nur ein einziges Mal genannt.*

² *Unser Awestā ist ein Gebetbuch, zu liturgischen Zwecken aus dem grossen Awestā ausgezogen.*

them. If any phrase disturbs the metre, which would be otherwise regular, it may be regarded as an interpolation. Now the question also arises, whether such phrases are composed by the compiler, or are extracts from some other genuine texts of the Avesta. All isolated passages, and especially such words and expressions as have no proper connection with the context, must be carefully examined. They should only be brought to bear generally on questions concerning the history of civilization, where they in no way contradict the other statements of the Avesta. Above all, we must beware of attaching too great importance to brief and isolated observations. On the contrary, we must be always careful that any passage brought forward as proof can be supported by others. As a rule, the evidence of language is not to be relied on. We do not even know how far the language of the original sacred books was familiar to the compilers of the "Liturgy." That the time which elapsed between the writing of the original Avesta and the compilation of the "Liturgy," was a period of transformation of language, is, so far as I am aware, generally accepted. At best, it is only when grammatical and material evidences coincide, that we may fitly attach importance to the latter.

§ 7. *The Home of the Avesta.*

After what I have said in my opening statement (1) the question may take this form: "What were the places inhabited by the Avesta people? In what country did the civilization represented in the Avesta take its rise and develop itself?" Every one will allow that the answer to these questions must be sought in the first place in the Avesta itself.

Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 3, pp. 639-640) says:¹ "Moreover, it is

¹ "Wenn ferner behauptet wird, das Awestā ignoriere den Westen Irāns vollständig, so ist das nicht richtig; denn das

incorrect to assert that the Avesta makes no reference at all to Western Irān; for not only is Lake Urumia (*Chai-chasta*) mentioned but also Babylon (*Bawri*). Thus it is familiar with the land west of the borders of Irān. Among the arguments in favour of an Eastern Irānian origin for the Avesta, particular stress is generally laid on the evidence of the register of lands in the first Fargard of the Vendidād, where only names of Eastern Irānian places occur. Without taking into consideration the fact that Ragha and Varena cannot be regarded as Eastern Irānian districts, and leaving out of account *Airyanem vaējaḡh*, we must nevertheless recollect that in Vendidād, I. 81, it is expressly stated that other places and towns existed whose names did not appear on the register. Besides this, I must confess that I consider the age of this first Fargard to be greatly over-estimated."¹

Prof. C. de Harlez agrees with the writer quoted above. (H. 3. p. 222):

"*Puis nous considérerions le pays de l'Avesta comme l'Eran septentrional et non comme oriental. Une région qui s'étend jusqu'au Sud de la Mer Caspienne, ne peut être prise pour l'Orient de l'Eran.*"

Awestā kennt nicht bloss den Urumiasee (*Tschaitschasta*) sondern selbst Babylon (*Bawri*), seine Kenntniss reicht also westlich noch über die Grenzen Irāns hinaus. Ein besonderes Gewicht wird bei den Beweisen für den ostirānischen Ursprung des Awestā gewöhnlich auf das Länderverzeichniss im ersten Fargard des Vendidād gelegt, wo angeblich nur ostirānische Orte genannt werden. Abgesehen davon, dass Ragha und Varena nicht als ostirānische Landschaften gelten können, um von *Airyanem vaējaḡh* zu schweigen, so muss man sich erinnern, dass Vd. I. 81 ausdrücklich gesagt wird, dass es noch andere Orte und Plätze gebe. Sonst muss ich gestehen, dass nach meiner Ansicht das Alter dieses ersten Fargards sehr überschätzt wird."

¹ Cf. similarly Sp. I. p. II.

As regards the latter remark it must be admitted that Ragha does not belong to Eastern Irān ; it lies close to the natural bridge connecting Western and Eastern Irān. Now, if all the other places mentioned are in Eastern Irān, then surely, in spite of Ragha being mentioned, we are justified in speaking of an "Eastern Irānian civilization." It must also at the same time be accepted as a known fact that at this one point only it extended beyond the frontiers of Eastern Irān. The very nature of the country sufficiently explains this circumstance ; for, when the Irānian people had reached the "Bridge of Khorāsān," they must necessarily have gone further westward, for deserts prevented their expansion towards the North and South.

At all events, it will be allowed that the name Eastern Irān is more appropriate than Northern Irān would be. To the latter must, however, belong Ātropātene, while it could never have included such places as *Haitumat*, *Harahvati*, *Pisana*, *Vaikerta*—pure Avesta names—which belong to modern Afghānistān.

Northern Irān, moreover, has no existence as a geographical division. Between the North and the South, whether towards the West (Media, Susiana, Persia), or towards the East (Afghānistān, Baluchistān), there is no natural boundary ; but the central desert of Persia divides the plateau of Irān into Eastern and Western districts. A line drawn from Asterābād through Tebbes to Kirmān, nearly marks the division ; but North and South of the Persian desert the two halves meet again.

The main point of my argument is this :—that, in spite of the reference to Ragha in the Avesta, the greater part of Media, all Ātropātene, Susiana, and Persia, were outside the pale of the Avesta people. But these were the very countries, which, in historical times, were especially the nurseries of the civilization of nations.

Hitherto I have confined myself entirely to meeting the

objections of Prof. C. de Harlez to the term "Eastern Irānian Civilization," on the ground that Ragha is mentioned in the Avesta. Let us now consider Dr. Spiegel's remark, against which a great deal may be urged.

i. Besides the register of countries in the Vendīdād, I also base my theory of an Eastern Irānian origin for the Avesta on the juxtaposition of all the names of places occurring in it, and on the very interesting passage, Yt. X. 13-14, where, speaking of Mithra, the *yazata* of the rising sun, it says :—

"Who first, decked with gold,
Grasps the bright mountain-tops ;
Thence he looks over the whole land
Of the Arians, the glorious one where
navigable waters,
Broad with swelling waves, flow
To *Ishkata* and *Poruta*,
To *Moru*, *Haraiva*, and *Gava*,
To *Sughdha* and to *Qārizem*."¹

Dr. Spiegel does not refer to this passage; and yet it is of special significance, for in it the name *airyō-shayana* is expressly used for the "Land of the Arians." Of the seven names of places it mentions, two, viz., *Ishkata* and *Poruta*,² are unknown; the others, without exception, are in

¹ Should any one be inclined to consider the words *ā ishkatem* to *qārizemcha* as an interpolation, the passage would in that case prove even more useful to my argument. The insertion would, of course, be of later date than the original text itself, and would serve as an additional proof that, even during a period later than that in which the Hymn of Mithra, (Yt. X. 13-14), was composed, the *airyō-shayana* was still confined to Eastern Irān.

² C. de Harlez also situates them in Eastern Irān (H. I. p. 448, note 1). *Ibid.* p. xxiv. and xlvi. with reference to the passage cited above from the Mithra Yasht.

Eastern Irān, and four of them appear also in the list of countries named in the Vendīdād.

Here, then, we have a very important passage, analogous to the register of places often quoted, which indisputably adds to its value.

2. I do not see what arguments can be adduced to disprove the antiquity of the first Fargard of the Vendīdād. This document need not be regarded only as an enumeration of tribes, but as a part of the Avesta itself; and that it is of later date than any other part cannot be proved with certainty. If this were so, it would be even more striking, that, with the exception of Ragha, only names of Eastern Irānian places occur in it. Again, we must not be misled by the frequent use of the modern forms of these names, for this is sufficiently explained by the various revisions of the Avesta, during which it is easy to conceive the revisers would have preferred to exchange obsolete names for such as were popularly current, or which at least nearly resembled those in common use.

I may further observe that I do not ascribe to the transcribers of the Avesta the alteration of the names, which was doubtless the work of the revisers, to whom the old terms were, indeed, no longer familiar. Again, the loose grammar of many passages in the Avesta must not be ascribed to careless copying of the manuscript, but rather to the ignorance of editors adapting their own language to the text.

3. The concluding passage, "There are also other places, &c.," proves next to nothing. The places could equally well have been in Eastern Irān, so far as may be inferred from the tone of the writer. At all events it would seem very singular that a Zoroastrian of Western Irān should look on the districts of Eastern Irān only as God-created, thus entirely ignoring the claims of his own country.

4. Bawri cannot be mentioned by way of proof. So far as the question relates to the home of the Avesta

people, we must confine ourselves to those districts only which are included in Irān. But Bawri was the home of the Dahāka, and therefore situated in a foreign country according to the Avesta. The power of Babylon may probably have been known to the old Irānians, but this is no reason for supposing that it was within the territory of the Avesta people.

5. It is by no means impossible that Chaichasta is Lake Urumia. If so, it forms a singular exception to the numerous other localities mentioned in the Avesta. Perhaps, as in the case of Bawri, we may assume that it was situated beyond the district inhabited by the old Irānians, lying, as a matter of fact, at a considerable distance to the West of their territory. Perhaps it was at some later period that the name Chaichasta was given to Lake Urumia. But upon this I shall dwell further on.

I must now discuss the question in detail.

As regards the geographical names occurring in the Avesta, I must refer to the list of mountains given in Yasht, XIX. 11 *seq.* It is to some extent of no value, since their exact positions cannot be assigned to these mountains. With the help of the Bundehesh some information can be gathered concerning the following names. The *Ushidāo* and the *Ushidarna* stand in Segestān, and therefore in Eastern Irān, as does also *Upari-saina*.¹ The *Antar-kangha* and *Sichindava* are to be looked for in Kandiz, i.e., on the frontier between Irān and China; *Syamaka* and *Vafraka* in Kābul. *Raiva* lies in Khorāsān and near it stand *Spentodhāta* and *Kadrva-aspa*, which, according to the Bundehesh, are situated near Tus (Meshed). Only the *Asnavāo* is situated in Ātropātene. Of the other mountains mentioned, the *Arzura*, *Mainakha*, *Vāti-gaisa*, and *Taira*, are well-known, and to these I shall revert further on. Finally, we must

¹ Cf. West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. pp. 36-37 note.

mention *Kauirisa*, which is supposed by the Vedas to be situated in Irān.

To the geographical statements of the *Bundehesh* I attach little importance, since it sets up a world-system of which no trace is to be found in the Avesta. Nevertheless, if we rely on its authority, all those mountains, the geographical positions of which we can trace with its help, must be in Eastern Irān, with the single exception of the *Asnavant*.

The following are the other geographical names occurring in the Avesta:—*Aryana-vaija*; the rivers *Dātya* and *Darja*; *Sughdha* and *Gava*; *Qārizem*; the rivers *Rangha* (with the *Gaudha* or *Gudha*) and *Ardvisura-Anāhita*; the mountains *Hara-bersati* with the *Taira* and *Hukarya*; *Kangha*, *Vaiska*, and *Khshathrō-sauka*; the lake *Voru-kasha*; *Moru*; *Bākhdhi*; *Nisaya*; *Haraiva* (*Vāti-gaisa*); *Vaikerta*; *Urva*; *Harahvati*; *Haitumat*; *Vehrkāna* (*Khnenta*); *Varna*; *Chakhra*; *Ragha*; *Pisina*; *Hapta-hindavo*; the lakes *Kansu*, *Chaichasta*, *Frazdānava*, *Husrava*, *Vanghazda*, and *Awzhdānava*; the mountains *Ushida* and *Ushidarna*, *Argura*, *Mainakha*, and *Ersifya*, and also the river *Vītanghvati*.

I need not here mention again *Bawri* and *Kvirinta*, since I have already stated my opinion regarding them; as also *Ishkata* and *Poruta*. Of *Ragha*, too, I have spoken already. Here the point in question only refers to those parts of Eastern Irān over which the Avesta people extended themselves. *Chakhra* and *Varna* mark the period of transition and are to be sought for, according to general belief, in *Tāberistān*. If, apart from this district, Eastern Irān was the scene of the civilization of the Avesta, are we not then amply justified in speaking of an Eastern Irānian civilization?

We may still further simplify our task. We may pass over the names *Vanghazda*, *Awzhdānava*, and *Vītanghvati*, as there is no means whatever of forming an opinion as

to their situation. The same may also be said of the mountains Mainakha, Erzifya, and Arzūra. The Aryana-vaija forms a group with the Dātya and Darja. Therefore, wherever the latter were situated the Aryana-vaija must have been near them, and its position is never distinctly described; but the description includes that of the Dātya and Darja. The same is the case with the Kangha, Vaiska, Khshathrō-sauka, and Hara-berzati which includes the Taira and Hukarya. Again the Sughdha and Gava, the Vehrkāna and Khnenta form one group.

The Rangha, the Ardvi-sura, and the Voru-kasha, are generally considered by my critics to be mythical places, and, as far as I know, no one has been able with any certainty to locate them in Western Irān. Therefore, they are also useless for purposes of evidence.¹

As regards the remaining names, nine of them belong indisputably to localities in Eastern Irān (Sughdha, Qārizem, Moru, Bākhīdhi, Haraiva, Harahvati, Haitumat, Vehrkāna, Pisina), since they exist there to the present day. The remaining eight, namely, Nisaya, Vāti-gaisa, Vaikerta, Urva, Hapta-hindavō, Kansu, and the mountains Ushida and Ushidarna,² are now generally recognized, even by my opponents, as having been situated in Eastern Irān. On four of the names or groups of names (Aryana-vaija, Hara-berzati, Kangha, Frazdānava), no unanimous decision has yet been arrived at; nevertheless most writers, at least in the case of the two last mentioned, are inclined to locate

¹ In my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," pp. 34 seq. and pp. 45 seq., I have explained the theory of the Rangha being the Jaxartes (Syr-daryā), the Ardvisura the Oxus (Amu-daryā), and the Voru-kasha Lake Aral or the Caspian Sea. Besides, this view is also shared by others.

² Doubts might certainly be raised as to the district of Nisaya, which means only "a settlement," nevertheless we have a passage in the Vendīdād (I. 8), where its situation is described. Cf. also M. Tomaschek, *Ausland*, 1883, pp. 822-823.

them in Eastern Irān. Only two localities, viz., the Lakes Chaichasta and Husrava are looked for in Western Irān, and this without any definite reason.

He must be very hard to satisfy who is not convinced by the arguments set forth above. In my opinion they point so decidedly to Eastern Irān as the home of the Avesta people that further confirmation seems hardly necessary. Nevertheless, I hope to be able to prove that Aryana-vaija and Hara-berzati should be sought in the East, or at least to show the insufficiency of the arguments on which the theory of their situation in the West is based. Lake Chaichasta we must deal with later on.

In the first place, as regards Frazdānava, no one has as yet assigned it to Western Irān, but the whole testimony of tradition agrees in locating it in the Eastern province.¹ Dr. Spiegel's latest remark on the subject is indeed somewhat diffident:—"Frazdānu or Frazdānava is, according to the Bundehesh, a lake in Segestān; but M. Lagarde has (not unreasonably) traced its name in that of the Armenian river Hrazdan, which is possibly correct"² Every one will surely allow that the similarity between an Armenian and an Irānian name proves nothing at all as regards the identity of the places named, but rather renders such identity improbable. The Avesta mentions a river Haravati and the Rig-veda a

¹ Cf. especially *Bahman-yasht*, ch. III. 13, West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 220. Aūharmazd spoke thus: "O Zarātūsh! the Spītāmān, when the demon with dishevelled hair, of the race of wrath, comes into notice in the Eastern quarter, first a black token becomes manifest, and Hūshēdār, son of Zarātūsh, is born near lake Frazdān." Again, Bundehesh, ch. XXII. 5 (*ibid.* p. 86).

² Vide Sp. I, p. 17: "Das Wasser Frazdānu oder Frazdānava ist nach dem Bundehesch ein See in Segestān; allein dasselbe Wort hat Lagarde mit Recht im Namen des Armenischen Flusses Hrazdan erkannt, an den man auch denken kann"

Sarasvati, but no one will venture to assert that these rivers were, therefore, identical.

Until quite recently, no difference of opinion existed concerning Kangha, Vaiska, and Khshathrō-sauka. The Avesta places Kangha evidently in Tūrān,¹ which is always understood to be the country north of the Oxus. The testimony of the Bundehesh, the Minokhired, and of the "Book of Kings" by Firdūsī, agrees with that of the Avesta. Kangha is always referred to as a district in the far North-East. *Here we surely have a firm footing, which we should not fail to make good,* unless we wish to cut away the ground from under our own feet. And yet Dr. Spiegel starts a theory that Kangha was in the West, (Sp. I, p. 20); but apparently without any authority, and in direct opposition to the evidence of tradition which he at other times values so highly. His line of argument runs as follows:—Kangha was the home of the Hunus, the enemies of Vishtāspa. The Hyauunas and the Vardhakas appear elsewhere in the Avesta as the foes of Vishtāspa. The latter may be identified with the Chionitae and Vartae, who dwelt on the western shores of the Caspian. But this is not possible, if Eastern and not Western Irān was the scene of Vishtāspa's career. So Dr. Spiegel thinks fit to locate Kangha, too, in the West and to look there also for the Hunus, though at the same time acknowledging that "there is much evidence to show that it was in Eastern Irān," adding, however, "but the possibility always remains, that there were Hunus also on the western shores of the Caspian."

But Dr. Spiegel, who laboured after a "historical" explanation of the Avesta with so much determination and achieved his object with so much success, makes the

¹ Yt. V. 53-54, 57-58. Cf. O. K. A. pp. 52-54, 198-199. Windischmann, Bréal, Justi, De Harlez, are all agreed in locating Kanga in the East.

following statement:—"The fact ought to be admitted that, as far as we can gather from native sources, Kangha was situated in the East." He ought certainly not to have sacrificed this fact for the sake of etymology. If it will not agree with the Chionitae, well and good; we must not try to identify the Hvyaunas with the latter, or else we must concede that Vishtāspa's activity extended to Eastern as well as to Western Irān. Can we not with justice use Dr. Spiegel's own words:—"The possibility remains that there were Hvyaunas (Chionitae) also on the western shores of the Caspian"?

Let us now consider the Chionitae and Vartae, whom Dr. Spiegel (Sp. I, pp. 16 seq.) would identify with the *Huyauna* and the *Varedhaka* of the Avesta. The identity is purely etymological and not historical. Does the identity of peoples follow from the identity of their names? The Mardoi, for instance, are said to have lived both in Persia and Hyrcania, and the Daai on the eastern shores of the Caspian, but at the same time beyond the Tanais-Jaxartes and in Persia.¹ Is it not rather probable that this similarity of names is only apparent? Even in external form the two words *Vardhaka* and *Vartae* are not alike. Dr. Spiegel² derives the word *Hvyaona* or *Hyaona* from the *haēna* of the Avesta and from the Middle Irānian word *hayūn*. Dr. Geldner,³ on the contrary, is of opinion that the word should be derived from *hva-yaona*, meaning "one who goes his way, a wanderer, a vagabond." According to him it is not generally a proper, but a generic name.

¹ Cf. vol. I. pp. 38, 40-41, O.K.A. pp. 203-204, 200-201.

² Dr. Spiegel's reference to the *hayūn rūi* in Firdūsī, which might be explained by the change of meaning from the Old Irānian *haēna* to the Middle Irānian *hayun*, is very ingenious. But the Syriac *hveenai* with its initial *hv* does not entirely suit this interpretation.

³ *Avestāstudien*, p. 83.

If this etymology be correct—and the passages in the Avesta seem to support it—then the identification of the Chionitae with the Hvyaua loses all value as historical evidence.¹

But, now what do we know of the Chionitae? Ammianus says of them:—“*Datiano et Cereali consulibus cum universa per Gallias studio cautiore disponerentur formidoque praeteritorum barbaricos hebetaret excursus rex Persarum in confinis adhuc gentium extimarum, iamque cum Chionitis et Gelanis omnium acerrimis bellatoribus pignore icto societatis redditurus ad sua, Tamsaporis scripta suscepit, pacem Romanum principem nuntiantis pascere precativum.*”

(17. 5. 1.)

If we add to this another passage from Ammianus (18. 6. 22),² to which Dr. Spiegel does not refer and wherein Grumbates, the king of the Chionitae, is mentioned with the king of Albania; we have the sum total of our knowledge of the Chionitae. From the latter being named with the Gelans, who must of course be understood to be the inhabitants of Gilan, and with the Albanians, it is indeed more probable that they dwelt on the western shores of the Caspian. On such an uncertain basis, or at all events on the mere identification of the names Hvyaua and Chionitae, does Dr. Spiegel ground his theory that Vishtāspa had his home in the West. Again, from the

¹ Spiegel's etymology of the names, Chionitae and Hvyaua, might of itself mark them as generic terms. As such *haēna* is often enough employed in the Avesta, (*vide* vol. I. pp. 28-29; *O. K. A.* pp. 191-192.).

² [Dr. Geiger here alters the wording of the passage (p. 329, ll. 6-18) as follows:—

“Fügen wir zu dieser Stelle eine andere (Amm. 18. 6. 22), deren Spiegel nicht gedenkt, und in welcher der Chionitenkönig Grumbates neben dem König der Albaner genannt wird, so ist das alles, was wir von den Chioniten wissen. Durch ihre Zusammen-

words, "This conquest of two nations¹ by Vishtāspa, in which Shapur II. was concerned " we gather that he assigns the origin of the Vishtāspa legend to the reign of King Shapur or still later. Now what can be his object in thus connecting it with Shapur? By so doing he deprives his argument of the last vestige of evidence. At least he cannot venture to assert that the original Avesta was written in the fourth century after Christ! If so, his conclusion would amount to this:—"The Vishtāspa legends of the Avesta bear a striking resemblance to the history of Shapur II., therefore, they are productions of that time."² Thus, then, they would lose all value as evidence for determining the home of the Avesta people and the antiquity of their civilization; and we should have gathered only one argument in proof of the spuriousness [?] of a portion of the book, especially of the passages quoted by Dr. Spiegel from the Yashts.

Accordingly, the theatre of Vishtāspa's wars was in the East; in the East we must endeavour to find the country of Kangha; and it was in the East that he fought with the Hvyauñas and Vardhakas, and, likewise,

stellung mit den Gelanen, unter denen wohl zweifellos die Bewohner von Gilan zu verstehen sind, und mit den Albanern wird allerdings wahrscheinlich gemacht, dass sie im Westen des Kaspischen Meeres wohnten. Auf diese unsichere Basis und auf die jedenfalls nur hypothetische Vergleichung der Namen Huyauna und Chionitae baut Spiegel seine Annahme, dass Vishtāspa im Westen gewohnt habe.]

¹ "Diese Besiegung zweier Völker durch Vishtāspa, mit welchen Schāpur II. zu thun hatte . . ." The second nation refers doubtless to the Vertae of Ammianus, i.e., the Vardhaka, but as far as I know we have no authority for supposing a conquest of the Vertae by Shapur; on the contrary, they appear to have been allies of the Persians (Amm. 19. 2.3).

² "Die Sagen über Vishtāspa im Avestā zeigen eine auffallende Ähnlichkeit mit der Geschichte Schāpurs II. Sie sind also ein Machwerk aus dieser Zeit."

with the Huns. With regard to the latter I am inclined to draw attention to a paper of M. Tomaschek's (*Ausland*, 1883, vol. LVI. p. 824), according to which the Finnish accounts of the invasions of the Northern Hiün-yo from the Gobi date back to 1750 B. C. The mention made of them in the Avesta strengthens rather than weakens the claims of that book to a high antiquity.¹

If, in the last few pages I have been now and then compelled to digress into matter that pertains to the second part of my treatise, I shall now confine myself to purely geographical questions in discussing the Hara-berzati.

I believe I may refer, in entering upon this subject, principally to my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," (pp. 42-45), in which I locate that mountain-range in the East, since the Avesta itself does so. When the Avesta says of Mithra, that he rises before the sun, as well as the moon and the stars over the Hara-berzati, it clearly proves that, for the author of such a passage, the Hara-berzati must have been situated in the East.² It is, therefore, impossible to identify that range with the Alburz mountains, lying on the southern shores of the Caspian, in spite of their names being identical. The Alburz lay exactly to the West as regarded Moru and Bākhdi, &c., and to the North with respect to the inhabitants of Ragha; but never with regard to any of the terri-

¹ As, for instance, Justi, (J. 1, Sp. 1476), has done: "He hesitates to recognize this people (the Huns) in the Hunu, because they belong to a time more modern than the writing of the Avesta;" he should rather have concluded that the passage, in which the Huns are mentioned, was of comparatively recent insertion. In my opinion Tomaschek has now arrived at the right conclusion, and dispelled my doubts.

² Again, it necessarily follows hence that the important part played by the Alburz in the world-system of the Bundehesh, is entirely unknown to the Avesta.

tories, in the East or South-East, mentioned in the Avesta.

Facts point the other way. I believe Hara-berzati to have been more than a local name. To such a range of mountains as those mentioned above, it is quite suited on account of its general meaning of "High Mountains." The conjecture is also confirmed by the fact that the name was not merely confined to the Alburz of the Caspian, but extended also to the Caucasus. The name Alburzond given by the Ossetes to the Elbrus, is evidently the same old Avesta word.

Since we have found the name Hara-berzati applied to two quite distinct mountain-ranges, may it not possibly have belonged likewise to a third? In the last we must, of course, recognize the great central highland of Asia, the Pāmir, the Thianshan, and the Alai, which must have seemed to the Irānians of the Avesta to coincide exactly with the eastern boundary of their world.

Finally, we come to Aryana-vaija and the rivers Dātya and Darja.

It is now, I believe, generally agreed that Aryana-vaija is known to the Avesta itself only as a semi-mythical land. This I have never denied; on the contrary, I have laid some stress upon it.¹ Hence two results may be deduced:—

¹ Cf. my *O. K. A.* p. 30: "As to the Irānians of the Avesta, Aryana-vaija had already, so far as they were concerned, passed out of the domain of history into the region of legend." Cf. also p. 32, where the reasons are given for its having been chosen by the Avesta as the home and dwelling of Zoroaster. Like Ahura Mazda and Yima he is called *srūtō-airyenē-vaejahi*, (*Ys.* IX. 14); and the place of his birth is pointed out on the Darja, (*Vd. XIX. 4. 11*), where the house of his father Porushaspa stood. Zarathushtra, therefore, belonged to the East, if, as I hope to be able to prove, Aryana-vaija must be assigned to that quarter. We need not be hampered by the comparatively modern evidence to the contrary. All the best Occidental testimony also goes to

firstly, that from the references to Aryana-vaija we must draw no elaborate historical conclusions; secondly, that it must have been a country beyond the true frontiers of the Irānian people, known to them more by tradition, verbal or written, than by personal experience, bearing almost the same relation to them as the *Rasā* did to the Arians of the Rig-veda. We must satisfy ourselves, therefore, with a somewhat general indication of the situation of Aryana-vaija.

The semi-mythical character of Aryana-vaija is revealed by the fact that in the Avesta it is reputed to be the home of Ahura Mazda.¹ There he makes known to Anāhita his will that Zarathushtra shall remain faithful to Him, and think, speak, and act according to His commandments. There, too, Ahura Mazda holds his meeting with the legendary king Yima; and Zarathushtra is likewise spoken of as the "renowned one in the country of Aryana-vaija."²

The Avesta is, and must always remain, the earliest source of information, and it is a help to us in ascertaining the position of Aryana-vaija; and here again we have to consider the evidence afforded by the register of countries

prove that Eastern Irān was the home of Zoroaster. "By far the majority of the old writers, moreover, describe Zoroaster as a Bactrian If against their statements it should be remarked that they are all modern, we might respond by saying that the accounts which call Zoroaster a Mede, are proved to be still later and less numerous." (Sp. I, p. 3.)

¹ [This fact does not necessarily prove the admixture of any mythical element in the Avesta description of Aryana-vaija; it rather confirms the Zoroastrian belief that the primitive land of the early *Mazdayasna* was the abode of all piety and blessings, where man was himself a spiritual power exulting in the glorification of the divine government, and, inspired with supernatural thoughts, was, in the moments of intense devotion, in communion with the Creator and the good genii. *Tr. n.*]

² Yt. V. 17-18; cf. Yt. XV. 2; Vd. II. 21; Ys. IX. 14. Hauma, too, offers up his prayer to Anāhita in Aryana-vaija. (Yt. V. 104).

in the Vendidād. If the antiquity of the register is disputed, at any rate no one will deny that it is of earlier date than the traditional Parsee writings; than the Bundelesh or the Minokhired; and at the time of its translation it was even regarded as an integral portion of the Parsee Scriptures and was translated, commented on, and interpreted in the same way as every other fragment of the great Avesta.

Again in Vd. I. 3 we find:—

"As the first of the lands and as the best dwelling-place, I, Ahura Mazda, created the *Aryana-vaija* (the country) situated on the good Dātya. Thereupon Angra Manyu, who is full of death, counter-created the water-serpents and a winter produced by the demons."

From this we gather two conclusions:—that Aryana-vaija was on the Dātya, and that it suffered from very severe winters. But more important still is the order in which the countries are enumerated in the Vendidād and the positions which each of them holds. Aryana-vaija heads the list, and is followed by Sughdha, Moru, Bākhdi, Nisaya, Haraiva, indisputably following the course from North to South. Hence it follows almost certainly that Aryana-vaija was further North than Sughdha. No objection can, therefore, be taken, if we locate it in *Upper Ferghanāh*.¹

¹ Even Justi is forced to admit that Aryana-vaija is represented by the Vendidād as the country furthest to the North-East (J. I, Sp. 1473), and I have as yet never come across any attempt to account for the extraordinary interpretation of the sequence in the register, which would be necessary if we were to identify Aryana-vaija with Arran! I might once more refer to the attempt I have made in my *O. K. A.* pp. 3-6, 76-78, to explain this order of names, which has met with the approval of Dr. E. W. West, who says: "It appears from these details (given by Dr. Geiger) which are illustrated by a carefully-drawn map of the whole

But, then, is this supposition at variance with the rest of the evidence afforded by the Avesta? By no means. I have collected all the passages in which Aryana-vaija is mentioned, *but in none* (with the exception of Vd. I. 4) *is there any direct evidence as to the situation of that country.* Hence I cannot find any warrant for what Dr. Justi says: "Other traditions of the Avesta and of more modern works *positively locate in the West* the primitive land of the Avesta people, and thus probably also the home of Zoroaster."¹ As far as Aryana-vaija and the Avesta are concerned, it is an assertion without any convincing evidence.

Again, the Avesta never alludes to the geographical situation of the Dātya. We only know that on its banks Zari-vari and Vishtāspa offered their prayers for success in battle.² Besides, it is only mentioned in the register of countries side by side with Aryana-vaija.

region described, that the apparent irregularities in the arrangement of the names of these lands are quite consistent with the assumption that they are mentioned in the order in which their inhabitants accepted the Avesta religion. And as half the names are readily identified with the names of places mentioned by Darius in his Cuneiform Inscriptions, or by Greek writers, and still in use, it seems most probable that the other half are also old names of lands still existing on the earth's surface, and are mythic only in so far as our present knowledge is insufficient to identify them with absolute certainty." (Vide the *Indian Antiquary*, Dec., 1882, pp. 349-350). It is not proper to plead simply the geographical ignorance of the author. How is it then possible that we can attach importance to the very regular sequence in isolated groups?

¹ "Sonstige Ueberlieferungen im Awesīā und in jüngerem Werken verlegen das Urland (unächst wohl das Vaterland des Zoroaster) bestimmt in den Westen."

² Yt. V. 112: IX. 29; In the same way, the two passages in the Avesta in which the Darja is mentioned (Vd. XIX. 4 and 11), are of less value in determining its distinct geographical situation.

But, now, what has led Dr. Justi¹ to identify *Aryana-vaija* with the country of *Arran* on the Lower Araxes near *Ātropātēnē*? A passage in the *Bundehesh*, which says: "Ārān-vēj lies at the side of Atrōpatkān."² He professes to find this confirmed by another passage: "The Dāitīk river (Dātya) rises in Ārān-vēj and flows through Gurjistān (Georgia)." But Gurjistān is simply a conjecture of his own, elegant though it may be. The latest translator, Dr. West, retains the manuscript reading, which is simply an inaccuracy in the Pāzand transcription of the word meaning generally "mountain-land" (Kohistān).³ Nor should any importance be attached to the name *Arrān*. The ancient *Airyana* corresponds rather with the Middle and Modern Irānian *Ērān* or *Irān* than with *Arrān*. Only compare *Airyaman* of the *Avesta* with the Pahlavi and Modern Persian *Ermān*.

Accordingly, I have set the scattered references of the *Bundehesh* side by side with the *Avesta*, and I do not think that it will be difficult to decide between the two.⁴ Here I may remark that the obscurity of the statements of the *Bundehesh* with regard to *Aryana-vaija* and the country belonging to it, may also be proved. That the Vara of Yima was situated close to *Aryana-vaija* is shown by the second chapter of the *Vendidād* and expressed in clear

¹ *Beitrage zur alten Geographie Persiens*, "Contributions to the Geography of Ancient Persia," p. 18.

² *Bdh.* XXIX. 12 (Justi, p. 70. 10). By-the-bye, I must observe that it is impossible that *Arrān* should have been regarded as a mythical place during the last centuries before Christ, in which, according to the view of my opponent, the *Avesta* must have been composed; since at that time it lay exactly within the pale of Irānian history and civilization.

³ West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 79, note 1.

⁴ Again, Duncker says (*Gesch. des Alterthums*, vol. IV. p. 24, note 4): "It still appears to me advisable to look for *Aryana-vaija* in the country lying near the sources of the Oxus."

words in the sixty-second chapter (para. 15) of the Minokhired.¹ Yet the Bundehesh locates it in Pars.²

But our view is further confirmed by the fact that the Minokhired,³ which is at least not less trustworthy than the Bundehesh, looks for Aryana-vaija in the East, and locates it on the borders of Kandiz, which belongs to the "country of the East," and which Dr. Justi himself describes as being in the far North-East.

1. Thus we have now arrived at the conclusion that all the geographical testimony of the Avesta points to Eastern Irān, save that Ragha is near the western frontier, and that there is no other place known to the present day, which lay further than Ragha to the West or South-West.

We must now turn to Lake Chaichasta. There is no doubt that, according to the Bundehesh, this lake was situated in Atropātene, and, therefore, it can only be identified with Lake Urumia.⁴ But it might be asked whether we have not here again another instance of the transfer of a name to a later period. Of course this view can be nothing more than a conjecture; but, nevertheless, something may be said in its favour.

¹ [Vide West, "Pahlavi Texts," part III. p. 109, "(12) The spirit of wisdom answered (13) thus: 'Kangdez is entrusted with the eastern quarter, near to Satavāyēs, (14) on the frontier of Airān-vēgō.'"] The Minōkhired contains no such references to the rule of the Arabians in Persia, as are to be found in the Bundehesh. Thus the former seems to lay claim to a higher antiquity than the latter.

² *Bdh.* XXIX. 14, (following West's Translation).

³ *Mkh.* LXII. 13-14. Here we are only struck by the statement: "Near to Satvēs," since the Star Satavaisa is elsewhere described as the ruler of the West.

⁴ West ("Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 85, note 4), states that Lake Urumia is called Khejest or Chechest by Hamdullāh Mustaūfi.

It was near Lake Chaichasta, that Frangrasyan (Afrāsiāb) was defeated and taken prisoner by Husrava.¹ Moreover, that the scene of the struggle between the Irānians and Tūrānians was the North-Eastern frontier of Irān, can scarcely be disputed. The Oxus forms the boundary between the two kingdoms, and, according as the one or the other gained the supremacy, so Khorāsān on the rivers Kāse and Shehd, Khvārizem (Khīwa), Dighistān, Soghd on the Gulzarriūn, or Kang-bihisht became the scene of conflict. The fact, that at this time the residence of the Irānian kings was placed by Firdūsī in Istakhr or in some other western town, is absolutely unimportant. This would be an anachronism. Here the whole question is only concerning the great opposition between Irān and Tūrān, which occupied all the early legendary epoch, and this hostility found vent in North-Eastern Irān.

We would, therefore, feel inclined to seek Chaichasta in the North-East. Anyhow, we must not admit that the history of the end of Afrāsiāb, related in the "Book of Kings," along with the abovementioned wars, wherein the Tūrānian king was driven to the North-East, appears inconsistent. If the name Chaichasta was transferred to Lake Urumia in the time of Firdūsī, then the story of Afrāsiāb's wanderings and of his discovery is easily explained. The later localizing of this legend on the shores of Lake Urumia, would have necessitated its being brought into harmony, for better or for worse, with the other narratives which place the scene of conflict exclusively in the North-East. The conclusion best in accord with the most ancient accounts, and certainly the simplest and most trustworthy one, would be that Afrāsiāb, after he had been driven further and further away by Khosraw, at length fell into the hands of his enemies near Lake Chaichasta.

¹ Yt. IX. 18, 21; XVII. 41. Cf. Yt. V. 49.

Is it not possible that it may have been Lake Issyk-kul? This conjecture—for naturally it is nothing more—was suggested to me by M. Tomaschek.¹

2. That such a transference of names as I would assume in the case of Lake Chaichasta, occurred in some instances, is not to be disputed. No one will maintain that the Rangha of the Avesta meant the Tigris, and yet this river is meant by the Arang of the Bundehesh. Dr. Spiegel has already directed our attention to the migration of the names, Kur and Araxes. The transference of the name Hara-berzati I have pointed out above. Now the question arises whether, in these cases, a migration from East to West or one from West to East is the more probable. When we consider that we can prove almost to a certainty that all the Indo-Irānian tribes lived in territories lying to the North and South of the Hindu-kush, we may at once admit the fact of a migration of the Irānian names of places westward, concurrently with the extension of that tribe in that direction, just as we may observe a south-easterly advance of Indian names. The theory of a migration of geographical designations from West to East would presuppose a perfectly artificial conformation of the many streams of migrating tribes opposed to one another.

3. I would now draw attention to the numerous names of places mentioned in the Avesta. Without exception they all lie within the boundary indicated by the (Avesta) register of countries. None of them, as we have observed, leads us further westward than Ragha. Can this be a mere accident? Should we then make an exception in the case of Chaichasta, an exception by no means authorized by the Avesta, (which contains no

¹ *Ausland*, 1883, p. 824. In determining the position of Lake Chaichasta we determine also that of Lake Husrava. If the former is the Issyk-kul, the latter is doubtless the Sson-kul. If, on the contrary, the former is Lake Urumia, then the latter must be Lake Van.

allusion to its geographical position), but only founded on a far later application of the name? Will not this *only* name be overborne, so to speak, by the weight of the rest? Does not the complete picture presented by all the geographical references in the Avesta concerning the home of the ancient Irānians, compel us to place Chaichasta also within the limits of Irān?

Fewer definite results are to be obtained from an examination of the ethnographical statements of the Avesta than by determining the geographical names. Here I may confine myself to a brief recapitulation of what I have already said on the subject in my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," (*vide supra* vol. I. ch. I. § 4, pp. 30 seq.; *O. K. A.* pp. 193 seq.)

I have already observed that the reference to the Hunus points to Central Asia and not to Western Irān. Similarly, I have discussed the names, Hvyauna and Vardhaka. Again, we must look for the Tūra in Central Asia, since the Oxus is actually mentioned as the boundary between their territory and that of the Irānians. The Dāhas, too, were divided from the Irānians by the Oxus. Indeed, Herodotus mentions a tribe of the Daai as inhabiting Persis, as well as the Mardoi and Sajartae. Moreover, we must assign the country of this nomadic tribe to the eastern shores of the Caspian, that is to say, the land of the Turcomans of the present day. Here their name is also preserved in the Middle Irānian expression *Dāhistān*.¹ Little need be said regarding the Sarima and the Sāni, since neither word seems to be a proper name, but rather a generic term. Thus Sarima might be traced in the modern Sarmatia without justifying any supposition as regards an identity or relationship between the two tribes. I would adhere to my explanation of *Maredha* = the Mardoi and

¹ Besides, the word *Dāha* meaning simply "enemy" may well have been applied to quite different races.

Driwika = the Derbikes, although Dr. Justi opposes this view. Again, the identification of *Barvara* with the appellation *Barbar* for the Hindu-kush tribes is not quite improbable. However, from these names we cannot infer anything that will help us to determine the home of the Avesta, as they are invariably spoken of as the plague of special districts, viz., Moru, Haraiva, and Bākhdi.¹

We must now turn to the question of the age of the Avesta.

§ 8. *On the Age of the Avesta.*

I.

We begin with a *documentum c silentio*.¹ The Avesta must have been in existence in a pre-Achaemenian, most probably in a pre-Median epoch. I.—Because the Avesta does not speak of any of the towns famous during the latter period, with the exception of Ragha, the high antiquity of which is thereby established. II.—The Avesta does not mention any of the names of nations that were commonly known at a later period. Neither does it allude to the Persians, Parthians, nor Medes, but simply to the Arians. III.—The Avesta contains no historical statement concerning the battles between the Medes and the Babylonians, the rise of the Persians, the prosperity and downfall of the Persian empire under the Achaemenian dynasty, the invasion of Alexander the Great, which agitated and reorganized the whole of the Orient, the states which rose on the ruins of the empire of Alexander, and the dominion of the Arsacidae.

Who will believe that a work so copious as the Avesta could thus ignore all contemporary (or antecedent) events

¹ Vd. I. 6, 9, 7.

and circumstances? This would be conceivable, if it were merely a book of laws and ritual. But the Avesta frequently treats even of external events. It speaks of the inroads of hostile troops. The Yashts describe the battles waged with foreign nations. Attention is constantly drawn to the national antagonism between Arians and non-Arians, and likewise to the economic antagonism between the nomads and the agriculturists. The tribal constitution pre-eminently appears from the testimony of the Avesta. Princes ruling over the separate districts and particularly powerful personages unite the different Arian kingdoms under their own sovereignty—of whom Kavi-Husrava is especially remarkable. Is it possible that there could have been not even a single event of sufficient importance to induce the writers of the Avesta to make mention of kings among the Achaemenidae or the Arsacidae, who possessed still greater power?¹

One can search the Avesta through and through, without finding a single statement to which all that we possess of Irānian history would give a clue. What is more natural than the assumption that it dates from a time in which there was no other trustworthy history of Irān. *As a matter of fact, by such a supposition, I think, much less is imposed upon our "faith" than by the assertion that this utter absence of historical allusion is purely "accidental."*

Such an accident is quite incredible, indeed, if we regard Western Irān as the home of the Avesta; but it is equally inconceivable if we place it in Eastern Irān. Read, for instance, Prof. Max Duncker's Outlines of the History of the Kingdom of Bactria² at the time of the Achaemenidae

¹ I have here only recapitulated, in order not to repeat myself, the several points which I have already treated at length in my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 176-210, pp. 425 seq.; (vol. I. pp. 11-48; *supra* pp. 1 seq.)

² *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. IV. pp. 15 seq.

and of the Greco-Bactrian Princes:—“ At no time was the Eastern part of the kingdom so shut off and isolated that it would have remained untouched by events passing round it.”

Dr. Spiegel writes:—“ Following the example of Prof. Rhode, it (*i.e.*, the first Fargard of the Vendidād) has often been compared with the list of tribes in Genesis; and, as a proof of its great antiquity, the fact has been adduced of the absence in the Vendidād of the name Ekbatana, which, therefore, was probably not built when the Fargard was written. This is surely a proof of a peculiar nature. May we not equally well conclude that Ekbatana had already lost its early importance.”¹ The proof would be singular, indeed, if it were confined to Ekbatana. But the question here refers, not merely to the Median capital, but also to all the important towns which were famous after the Median period. Not only is Ekbatana ignored but also Susa, Pasargadae, Persepolis, Istakhr, Hecatompylos and Seleucia. The several Alexandrias and such towns as Markanda, Cyropolis, &c., are not even once mentioned. How significant, therefore, is the fact that, of all the cities of the West, only ancient Babylon is named in the Avesta! The renown of that powerful city spread even to the rugged highlands of Eastern Irān.

* “Nicht selten wird derselbe (der erste Fargard des Vendidād) nach dem Vorgange Rhodes mit der Völkertafel der Genesis verglichen und als Beweis für sein hohes Alterthum der Umsland angeführt, dass Ekbatana nicht genannt werde und daher noch nicht gebaut gewesen sei als jener Fargard geschrieben wurde. Dieser Beweis ist seltsam, man kann ebensogut daraus schliessen, dass Ekbatana damals seine frühere Bedeutung schon eingebüßt hatte.” (Sp. 2, p. 640). Against Dr. Spiegel’s remarks on Ekbatana, it must also be observed that this city was not only powerful and famous in antiquity, but that its historical importance continued unimpaired from olden times throughout the Middle Ages, and survived more or less down to the last century of our era.

To the second reason also, which I have adduced in proof of the great antiquity of the Avesta—namely, the absence of all names of nations, such as Medes, Persians, Parthians, &c.,—we may attach no small importance, since they are in fact the names by which the Irānian races were universally known in historical times. It must seem doubly striking to those who endeavour to identify the Āthravans of the Avesta with the Magi of the Medes; for the religious and political conflict between the latter and the other tribes belonging to the Irānian empire, particularly the Persians, must inevitably have caused that name to be mentioned at least once. Let us see what evidence Herodotus furnishes and consider the passage in which he says: “The Medes were also called Arians.” Even this statement supports my argument. It runs as follows: ἔχαλεοντο δὲ πάλαι πρός πάντων Ἀριοι. Thus in πάλαι they were called “Arians.” In the time of Herodotus, *i.e.*, in the fifth century B. C., the name was already antiquated, or at least its use was restricted. In the Avesta, on the contrary, *airyā* is the only recognized and universal designation of the people.¹

It must not, however, be inferred that by the name “Arian” the Avesta people are brought into close connection with the Arians of the Rig-veda. In the case of the latter also, and especially in all ancient writings, the name Ārya is an ethnographical designation, which, in later times, when the conquest of the habitable territory was finally accomplished, sank to the level of a mere class-name comprising the members of the three higher castes. In Irān, likewise, we find the name Ārya used only in the Avesta; but in later times, when the original nation had broken up into distinct tribes, the name entirely disappeared, giving place to the names of individual tribes.

¹ Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 168-169; (vol. I. pp. 2-3).

In endeavouring to find positive proofs of the great age of the Avesta, we must look chiefly to internal evidence.

Here I refer principally to the economic conditions of the Avesta people, a feature of their civilized life to which I have devoted particular attention in my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians," but which unfortunately has not as yet been sufficiently studied.

The existence, at every period of history, in Irān, and particularly in Eastern Irān, of nomadic tribes, side by side with those who pursued agriculture, and the continuance of this discordant feature down to the present day, are explained by the nature of the country. We need not, therefore, deduce the great age of the Avesta from the traces of nomadic life we may find in it. But the fact assumes quite a different aspect, when the Avesta takes us back to a period, wherein parts or sections of the people in general make a first attempt to change their wandering life for a settled one, to a period in which the discordant element, which afterwards became historical, makes its first appearance. It makes an immense difference whether primitive economic conditions appear only incidentally or whether they occupy the whole life and form the highest and essential interests of the people; whether, in short, religious and economic reforms go hand in hand.

I would here ask those who seek to identify the Athravans of the Avesta with the Magi of the Achaemenian and pre-Achaemenian periods, whether they can discover in those periods that warm interest on the part of the priests in agricultural matters, that eager support and encouragement of agriculture and cattle-breeding which are so prominently displayed in the Avesta? For my part, I cannot imagine such a thing; for it hardly seems possible that, at a time when political feeling and party spirit ran so high, the Magi should have earnestly busied themselves with the laying out of fields, the planting of trees, and the digging of wells and canals. If we bear in mind the

intrigues with which they were concerned after the death of Cambyses, we can no longer recognize in them the spirit of a simple and homely tribe of herdsmen and peasants, such as are the people described in the Avesta, which we are asked to regard as the Sacred Code of these very Magi!

This matter, however, requires to be somewhat more closely studied, in connection with the highly important question of the age of the Gāthās and the relation they bear to the rest of the Avesta.

II.

While I hold the Gāthās to be by far the oldest part of the Avesta, I do not entirely ground my belief upon the evidence of their language. Although it bears many marks of great antiquity, still it is not quite free from later and more polished forms of expression. Again, the language of the Gāthās is essentially a distinct dialect, the difference of which from that of the rest of the Avesta may be easily explained by its having belonged to a different country.

Nor do I lay stress upon the fact that the Gāthās are quoted in other parts of the Avesta; for these quotations may, as I believe, have been inserted in later revisions. They testify more to the great reputation than to the great age of these sacred hymns. At the same time it is not improbable that their reputation may have been due to their priority in point of time.

This assumption is corroborated by another fact. The metre of the Gāthās, although not so simple as that of the later books of the Avesta, has evidently remained comparatively undisturbed. Like the rest of the Yasna, the Gāthās have not during their revision been, so to say, remodelled; they were rather inserted in the Avesta as a book complete in itself. The Vendīdād was handled in the same way, but was at first somewhat violently recast and varied with copious insertions. Evidently, therefore, the

Gāthās were considered as more sacred than the Vendidād; the reason of which was probably that they were attributed to Zarathushtra himself or his immediate disciples. There must have been some ground for such a belief. I am not quite ready to accept the theory entirely as it stands; however, it has always appeared to me to bear some marks of probability.¹

We have more valuable evidence of the age of the Gāthās, in the fact that the personages who speak and act in them appear as the contemporaries of the poet, whilst in the rest of the Avesta they are represented as belonging to a remote past. I do not know why this feature has been so long ignored. This circumstance, which gives, so to speak, its present and actual character to the Gāthās, constitutes the chief difference between them and the other parts of the Avesta, and necessitates the theory of a great difference in age.

For instance, Zarathushtra is addressed in person in the passage, (Ys. XLVI. 14) :—

“ O Zarathushtra, who is thy pious friend

In thy great work? Who is it, that wishes to announce it?

¹ Let me quote a remark of Dr. Justi, (J. 1, Sp. 1479) :—

“ so machen bei dem Verfasser, der doch sonst methodisch zu Werke geht, solche Anwendungen von sympathie mit der Gāthā forschung des sel. Haug einen sonderbaren Eindruck.”

“ This keen sympathy with the Gāthā investigations of the deceased Dr. Haug, from an author generally so methodical, is strange enough.” If this is meant as a reproach, I accept it gladly. I must not deny that Dr. Haug is often too subjective, but for our knowledge of the right way to comprehend the Gāthās, we are much indebted to him. I am only sorry that I did not know it sooner! As an instance of my sympathy with Dr. Haug, Dr. Justi should certainly not have quoted the comparison of shkyāoma with the Indian *soma*, since I have utterly declined to endorse it.

It is he himself Kavi Vishtāspa, the armed-for-battle,
And whomsoever, O Ahura Mazda, Thou choosest
from the settlers:

Them will I extol with the holy sayings of the pious
mind."

And Zarathushtra himself utters the words, (Ys. XLVI.
19):—

"Whoever in piety shows me truly good deeds,
To me, Zarathushtra, to him shall be granted
As a reward yonder next world, of all worlds the most
worthy to be aspired to."

In a similar manner Frasha-ushtra, (Ys. XLVI. 16) and Jāmāspa, (Ys. XLVI. 17; XLIX. 9), who belong to the race of the Hvogvids, are personally addressed in the Gāthās. In other passages Frasha-ushtra or Vishtāspa is placed side by side with the poet who says: "To Vishtāspa and to me," "For Frasha-ushtra and also for me." (Ys. XXVIII. 8 and 9; Ys. XLIX. 8; cf. also, Ys. LI. 16-18). Likewise, Poruchista, the daughter of Zarathushtra, is personally addressed (Ys. LIII. 3).

This personal character is common to all the Gāthās. They seldom refer to Zarathushtra's work as a reformer. The poet mostly explains his own views, himself reveals the truth of his religion to the people and utters maxims of worldly wisdom or biology. The teaching of Zoroaster does not yet appear as a complete creed, but it is in course of forming and developing. The poet also frequently dwells upon the events—of which I shall speak further on—passing around him, as, for instance, the persecution of the Zoroastrian community.

It is, I believe, incorrect to suppose that in the Gāthās we have only to deal with purely imaginary personages who utter or listen to the words of the Prophet. Why should we make such an assumption only regarding the Gāthās and not the rest of the Avesta? The former are

subjective poems, the latter on the contrary is merely a later compilation, wherein we only meet with the words of Zarathushtra and his teaching as quoted on his authority.

I now come to the main point.

Whoever studies the historical and economical conditions of the old Irānian people, as they are described in the Gāthās and in the other parts of the Avesta, must necessarily perceive that a substantial difference existed between the two. This has been already pointed out by me; but it is necessary that I should do so here again, as hitherto all the facts have not been entirely considered.¹

In the Gāthās the cow is the central object of Irānian economy. How important a part this animal plays in the sacred hymns, every one knows who has read even a few lines of them. This can only be satisfactorily explained by assuming that the cow was probably esteemed and cared for by the Irānian people in the age of the Gāthās, just as it was by the Arians of the Rig-veda, and that great and special attention was paid to its breeding and rearing.²

The fruits of agriculture, the ploughing of the land, the sowing of seed and the harvest are all, indeed, mentioned in the Gāthās; nevertheless they are treated as subordinate to the care of the cow.

We thus find the people of the Gāthās in a particular phase of civilization, which will be recognized by every one who is familiar with the laws of the early economic development of nations. I mean the first transition from the life of the nomad to that of the settler, which is so closely bound up everywhere with the breeding of cattle. A people who have devoted themselves to cattle-breeding and have

¹ Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 177-179; 403-406; 465-468 (*vide* vol. I. pp. 15-16; 228-229; *supra* pp. 49-51).

² Cf. Ys. XXVIII. 1; XXIX. 1-10; XXXI. 9-11, 15; XXXII. 12, 15; XXXIII. 3, &c.

experienced how much more difficult it is to keep herds of large cattle than flocks of sheep and goats, become naturally inclined to greater stability and more permanent settlements in one place. Stronger and more lasting dwellings are erected; fields are cultivated with greater care and more systematically than by nomads, who support themselves only by reckless *raubbau*.

That I am drawing a real, and not merely a fanciful picture of the economic conditions of the Gāthā people, may be demonstrated by innumerable passages. It is asserted, in express terms, that it is the cow which is the giver of permanent homes; which means that by cattle-breeding lasting settlements are occasioned and developed, (Ys. XLVIII. 6). And, since continuous dwelling in one and the same place must naturally lead to a systematic tilling of the soil, the breeding of cattle is accompanied with the development of agriculture. This is expressed in the Gāthās (Ys. XXXI. 10) in the following wise :—The cow decides in favour of the active labourer; among agriculturists alone she finds the care and attention she requires. This explains what Dr. Roth has already remarked :—“ The two verses, 9 and 10, express the singular idea that the cow, the creation of which was a sign of God's special favour towards mankind, has, despising other masters, allowed herself to be as it were the property of the peasant.”¹

We observe a difference in the later books of the Avesta. Herds still play an important part; but here agriculture and cattle-breeding are held in *equal* honour. Let us read only the third Fargard of the Vendidād, which is devoted entirely to inculcating the duty of cultivating the land, of

¹ “ *Die beiden, verse 9 und 10, sprechen den eigenthümlichen Gedanken aus, dass die kuh, deren Schöpfung eine besondere Gunst Gottes gegen die Menschen ist, andere Herren verschinähend sich dem Bauern gleichsam zum Eigenthum gegeben hat.* ” (Ys. XXXI. p. 24.)

raising cattle and attending to all things connected therewith, and we are at once struck by this fact, that agriculture had at least become equal in importance to cattle-breeding. One need only compare the list of the meritorious works which delight the Spirit of the Earth:— I.— Piety and a law-abiding course of life. II.—The founding of a permanent household. III.—The cultivation of grain, of fodder for cattle, and the planting of trees. IV.—The breeding of sheep and cows (Vd. III. 1-5). Agriculture has, likewise, reached a comparatively high state of technical development. The land is artificially irrigated and drained. Ditches, wells, and canals are made; in short the Old Irānian knows how to assist sparing nature by means of art.

Moreover, along with the economic change, a religious revolution is plainly observed in the Gāthās, and the most noteworthy feature is that they are both intimately connected. The new doctrine is often represented as being oppressed and endangered. At first it is slowly gaining ground among the Arian people. The teaching of Zarathushtra finds followers among the peasants, while the nomads keep aloof from it. It recommends the keeping of herds and extols the founding of permanent settlements, and Zarathushtra is described in the twenty-ninth chapter of the Yasna, as the one chosen by the Almighty and His Amesha-spands to protect the cow from the oppression of the wicked.¹ Zarathushtra then, perhaps a name representing an entire epoch in the history of the civiliza-

¹ Moreover, this hymn must have been composed at the time of some specially grievous disaster; for the Soul of the Cow even doubts the possibility of its protection by Zarathushtra. The other passages, which point to the struggle for existence of the new religion and its close connection with the economic revolution, are Ys. XXVIII. 6; XXX. 2; XXXI. 1, 11-12, 18; XXXII. 3-7, 10; XLIV. 9; XLV. 1; XLVI. 14, &c.

tion of the Avesta people, appears before us as the reformer equally of the economic and of the religious life.

We turn to the later Avesta and quite a different view unfolds itself before us. While the Gāthās exhibit an *ecclesia militans* (a church militant), here, on the contrary, we find the church firmly established. The direction of the people is in the hands of a favoured class. The Āthravans, whose name never occurs in the Gāthās,¹ form the first order. The religious struggle for existence has ceased. There are, it is true, the wicked ones, the unbelievers and the false prophets. These are cursed, denounced, punished, but not feared. The doctrine of Zarathushtra is finally established. Sacrifices, ceremonies, customs, laws, and also such precepts as relate to daily life occupy considerable space.

But, although from what was simple in the beginning a mature system has developed, the later parts of the Avesta still deal with the simple and homely lives of peasants and shepherds. Here also religion is quite inseparable from the punctual fulfilment of the professional duties of the peasantry.² But at the same time other passages are not wanting, in which the meritousness of cattle-breeding and agriculture is extolled, where the divine agencies are implored to grant the possession of happy homesteads and innumerable herds of horned cattle and horses.³

Finally, I refer in this place to Dr. Roth's excellent paper on the "Calendar of the Avesta and the Gāhanbars,"⁴ which, I believe, safely expounds the theory that the Avesta calendar was intended for a nation composed of agriculturists and herdsmen, whose annual feasts coincided respectively with the incidents of a farm life. Besides the festivals celebrated at the summer

¹ Comp. my *Ostirān. Kultur*, p. 465; (*supra* p. 49).

² Let us read only Vd. III. 23-33.

³ Cf., e.g., Ys. LX. 2-3; Ys. XI. 1-2; Yt. VIII. 19; X. 3, II; V. 86, 98 and *passim*.

⁴ *ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. p. 698.

and winter solstices, there were also other feasts at the seasons of mowing, gathering the harvest, and driving the herds into summer-quarters. Moreover, the Avesta calendar, as I have already shown, bears the character of an essentially lunar chronology, which could only be conceivable in a highly primitive stage of civilization.¹

Two conclusions may be deduced from the above facts:—

I. The character of the entire Avesta shows clearly that the civilization it describes was simply a civilization of agriculturists and herdsmen. It cannot be supposed that under a mighty empire, such as that founded by the Achaemenides, the priesthood could have maintained such close relations with rural affairs, and that religious duty and the fulfilment of *agricultural* pursuits could have had such intimate reciprocal action, as even to be regarded as identical.

II. In the Avesta itself we find clear proofs of domestic and social progress. The Gāthās carry us back to a very early epoch, when portions of the Avesta people made the first attempts to introduce cattle-breeding together with

¹ This seems to me to be a very important argument in favour of the great age of the Avesta. It is impossible to conceive that a primitive rural calendar could have found a place in the writings of the priests at the time of the Achaemenidae or even later, when the Irānians were in the closest communication with the Chaldeans. As specially archaic traits of the calendar I note the following:—1.—Time was reckoned simply from one lunar phase to another. 2.—The week consisted, therefore, of fifteen days, as we may gather clearly from the intervals between the periods of the festivals. 3.—The variability of the synodic month was compensated by the insertion of an additional or 15th day in each half, which could evidently be omitted at the beginning if required. Comp. *Ostirān. Kultur*, pp. 314 seq. (vol. I. pp. 142 seq.). Prof. C. de Harlez is of opinion that the calendar of the Avesta was simply an invention of the priests (H. 2, pp. 165 seq.). This, however, is only true of the names of the days and months. Dr. Roth has pointed out how, in the same way, the Gāhanbars are intimately connected with the life of the citizen (*ZdmG.* vol. XXXIV. pp. 698 seq.).

the formation of permanent settlements. In the later Avesta, agriculture and cattle-breeding go hand in hand, and it even seems that prominence is given to the former.¹ Again, in the Gāthās, we see Zoroastrianism struggling for existence, while in the rest of the Avesta it appears victorious and firmly established. The Gāthās, therefore, were composed earlier than the other portions of the Avesta.

III.

The primitive and antique conditions of the Avesta people, however, are revealed by a series of particular facts, which seem deserving of special notice.

I.—The Avesta people do not seem to have yet known of salt and its uses.

II.—Glass was unknown.

III.—Coined money was not in circulation. Payment was made in kind.

IV.—The working of iron was unknown.

The Avesta nation is still in the bronze period.

If I succeed in establishing these four points, or even one of them, it must, I believe, be admitted that we can no longer think of assigning the composition of the Avesta to the latest centuries before our era.

On the first point I may be brief; for in support of our view, we can adduce an argument, than which none can be better, namely, the fact that salt is nowhere mentioned in the Avesta. However striking this must appear—for in the lists of eatables there would have been many opportunities for mentioning this most important

¹ Also Roth (*ibid.* p. 714) says: “*Die Irānien des Awestā sind gleichmässig Bauern und Viehzüchter; nur in den Leidern nimmt die Herde die erste Stelle ein, wie im Veda.*” “The Irānians of the Avesta are at the same time farmers and cattle-breeders; only in the hymns, as in the Veda, the preference is given to herds.”

of condiments—it cannot be supposed that this absence of any reference to salt is to be attributed to a mere accident. I should have left this subject almost untouched, had it not been worth while to give prominence to the curious coincidence that in the Rig-veda, too, salt is never mentioned.¹ The question, therefore, forces itself upon us, whether in this point, as in many others, we should not recognize a close analogy in the conditions of the Vedic and the Avesta Arians during the progress of their civilization. Allowing this to be only a possibility, or, at most, a probability, it must, at any rate, serve to strengthen other arguments. If we can otherwise prove that the civilization of the Avesta bears marks of great antiquity, we can no longer look upon this absence of any name for salt as a mere accident, but a highly characteristic mark of the nature of that civilization.²

That glass was unknown to the Avesta people can be proved with almost absolute certainty.

In the eighth Fargard of the Vendidād we find an enumeration of manufactures in which fire is employed. In my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians,"³ I have rendered the expressions *Khumbat-hacha-Zemaini-pachikāt* and *Khumbat-hachat-Yāmo-pachikāt* "the burning of tiles," and "the burning of pottery." Dr. Spiegel has,

¹ Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 54.

² Cf. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 149-150. [It is, indeed, very curious that salt and its use were not well known to the Avesta people as well as to the Arians of the Rig-veda, notwithstanding the existence of salt lakes and salt-steppes in Central Asia and near the Indus. It seems, therefore, that the Indo-Irānian people made little or no use of salt, but that, according to M. Hehn (*Das Salz*, p. 17), its uses became known to the European section of the Indo-Germanic tribe after its emigration from the fatherland. That there were salt lakes in Irān does not necessarily argue in favour of Prof. de Harlez's theory that salt was not unknown to the Avesta nation. Tr. n.]

³ Vide vol. I. p. 214, note 3, *Ostirānische Kultur*, p. 390.

in the first volume of his "Commentary on the Avesta," (p. 264), identified *yāma* with *jām* and translated it "glass." Dr. Justi also writes in his Review of my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians":—"In page 390 our author translates *yāma* by 'crockery,' to distinguish it from 'earth' or 'clay' (Av. *Zemaini*) of the preceding sentence. The Pahlavi translation does not throw any light on the meaning, since the same words are somewhat erroneously used in rendering both the passages. But to the second passage there is added a gloss which we might read *dōsānkārān* and translate 'plaster-worker,' (Mod. Pers. *dos* 'flowers worked in plaster,') while the gloss on the first passage is obscure. The Riwāyets give for *Zemaini*, the Mod. Persian word *khum* ('earthenware vessel, tile-work), whilst for *yāma* they give tile-furnace.' Dr. Geiger is right in his identification of this word with the Mod. Persian *jām*, but *jām* does not mean an earthen vessel, but a glass-bowl, a glass. He is of opinion that glass was unknown to the early Irānians; nevertheless glass slag must have been familiar to the potters and bronze-workers. Glazed tiles were made in Mesopotamia long before the time of Zarathushtra, and we have an Egyptian glass bottle of the seventeenth century before Christ, showing that the art of glass-painting and the use of the grinding-wheel were already known. Again we have the celebrated picture of the glass-blower on the grave of Beni-Hasan. It is a remarkable fact that the Persian word *abacaein* (Mod. Pers. *ābgīnāh*) was known to the Copts, and that the *Abha-stone* is mentioned under Thothmes III. Although the Avesta may be a very old record, yet it is inconceivable that such a valuable substance as glass should have been unknown to the people it describes."¹

¹ Vide J. I, Sp. 1477: "S. 390 will der Verfasser *jāma* mit 'irdenes Gefäss' übersetzen, zum Unterschied von Erde, Lehm (*zemaini*) im vorhergehenden Satz. Die Pehlevi-übersetzung gibt

If we consider the question concerning the identification of the word *yāma* with the Mod. Pers. *jām*, the difficulty lies probably in the meaning "goblet." The particular rendering "glass-bowl" is only a secondary development. The authority of tradition, as Dr. Justi has justly remarked, is uncertain; however, it is generally admitted that tradition has never recognized either *zemaini* or *yāma* as glass. From the glass slag familiar to the potter and the bronze-worker to the fashioning of glass vessels is a considerable step. As regards the knowledge of glass-making among the Egyptians and Mesopotamians, it cannot supply any argument as to the acquaintance of the Avesta people with that art.

It will be conceded to me that Dr. Justi's whole argument rests on this truth, that, if it were possible from the Avesta to show that as a fact glass was unknown, the great antiquity of this record together with the isolation of its people

keinen Aufschluss, da sie durch einen Irrthum beide Sätze durch dieselben Worte wiedergibt; doch fügt sie im zweiten Satz eine Glosse hinzu, welche man dōsīn-karān lesen und Gypsbereder (np. dōs 'Gypsblüte') übersetzen könnte, während die Glosse des ersten Satzes dunkel ist. Die Riteyets haben für *zemaini* np. khum (irdenes Gefäss, Ziegelbau), für *jāma* aber Ziegelofen. Wenn G. selbst das np. *jām* vergleicht, so hat er recht, aber *jām* ist nicht ein gebranntes Gefäss, sondern ein Glasbecher, ein Glas; er glaubt, die Altpersianer hätten das Glas nicht gekannt, und doch mussten die Töpfer und Erzarbeiter Glasschlacken kennen lernen; glasierter Ziegel sind längst vor Zarathuschtra in Mesopotamien fabriziert worden, und man hat eine ägyptische Glasflasche aus dem 17. Jahrhundert, an welcher man bereits die Kunst des Ueberfangens und die Anwendung des Schleifrades erkennt, wie auch die Abbildung der Glasbläser im Grab von Beni-Hasan berühmt ist. Es ist merkwürdig, dass das Koptische das persische Wort abacaein (np. ābgīnah) kennt und dass unter Thothmes III. der Abhastein erwähnt wird. Es ist undenkbar, dass eine so geschätzte Ware wie das Glas dem Awestävolk unbekannt geblieben wäre, selbst wenn das Awestā sehr alt wäre."

and the seclusion of their trade, would be proved beyond question. But such a proof can be actually adduced.

Wherever the Avesta treats of the purification of polluted vessels, it enumerates the materials of which the vessels used are made. They are—1, gold; 2, silver; 3, brass; 4, copper; 5, stone; 6, clay; 7, wood.¹ Here glass is not named. Moreover, it is clear that, had there been vessels of glass, they would have been subject to cleansing and would have required cleansing just as much as vessels of metal, stone, or earthenware.

We now come to the question respecting the use of coined money.

Again Dr. Justi differs from me, saying:—"Also in consequence of over-estimating the age of several passages in the Avesta,² our author is led to doubt the existence of money. Even supposing that *shaeta* does not mean 'money,' but only 'possessions, wealth,' yet the expression *asperena*, which means a *dirhem*, according to the Pahlavi Translation and the Zend-Pahlavi Farhang, points to the fact that in Mesopotamia a system of regular coinage and weights was not unknown."

¹ Vd. VII. 73-75.

² Vide J. I, Sp. 1477: "Auch ein anderes Bedenken nämlich die Existenz von Geld anzunehmen, ergibt sich dem Verfasser aus der Ueberschätzung des Alters mancher Avestastücke; wenn auch *saeta* nicht "Geld," sondern "Besitz, Reichthum" bezeichnet, so deutet doch der Ausdruck *asperena*, nach der Pehleviübersetzung und dem Zend-Pehlevi Farhang ein Dirhem, darauf hin, dass man das in Mesopotamien übliche Münz und Gewichtssystem kannte." Also in Sp. 1476, Justi speaks generally of "certain" parts of the Avesta, the age of which must not be over-rated. This statement is not very clear. It would have been better, had he indicated by a few words what passages he was referring to. According to his remarks it must be assumed that he considers a certain portion of the book to be of a great age, since he never speaks of any over-estimation of the age of the whole Avesta.

According to Dr. Justi's representation, it appears that I treat the great age of the Avesta as a kind of dogma, and on the ground of it reject entirely the possibility of coined money having existed in its time. In my "Civilization of the Eastern Irānians,"¹ I have pursued a diametrically opposite course. The basis of my argument is the text itself, and I quote three passages from the Avesta, all of which, as far as I know, treat of the question of payments, and which Dr. Justi never mentions. But in all these passages cattle (asses, oxen, horses, camels, sheep) are expressly mentioned as the medium of payment.

These passages occur in the following connections:—

- (a) Where the Avesta speaks of the payment of fees by a patient to a doctor. Here it is noteworthy that the very smallest fee is to be paid in kind, viz., in bread or milk, (Vd. VII. 41-43).
- (b) In treating of the atonement for a broken promise, or of the giving of a pledge on settling an agreement (Vd. IV. 2 *seq.*)²
- (c) Where reference is made to paying down the appointed fees to a priest after the ceremony of purification has been performed (Vd. IX. 37-39).

Is it at all possible for anybody to believe seriously that the Magi of the later Achaemenian period or even of the Seleucian or Parthian epoch, would have consented to receive payments in sheep, oxen, or horses?

On the authority of these three passages, we are, I believe, justified in forming an opinion as to money transactions among the Avesta people; and thus it only remains to explain the terms *shaeta* and *asperenda*.

M. Tomaschek is of opinion that *shaeta* may possibly

¹ *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 396-397 (vol. I. pp. 220-221).

² For explanation cf. *ibid.*, pp. 454-455; *supra* pp. 36-37.

have designated also coined money, since in the Persian language we find the feudal term *shait* used for a rouble.¹ This hardly seems to me to be a valid argument. The etymology of the word *shaeta* or. *khshaeta* and its use in different passages prove that in the Avesta language the word signifies nothing more than "fortune, possessions." With *shaeta*, (*i.e.*, with cows, sheep, or horses), a deed of blood is expiated.² A warlike hero protects his *khshaeta*, that is, his goods and chattels from thieves and robbers.³ Ardvī-sura grants prosperity to the *shaeta*. She multiplies the possessions of her adorers.⁴ I will return further on to the passage in which *shaetavat*, "the opulent man," is contrasted with the *ashaeta*, "the pauper."

So in every case *shaeta* has only a general meaning; and, if we hold firmly to the view that the word means "possessions," it becomes quite easy to explain how in later times, after coined money had come into use, the name *shaeta* came to be applied to it. A change of meaning perfectly analogous is exemplified in the Latin word *pecunia*, which originally meant simply "the possession of cattle," then came to mean "fortune" generally, and finally, in spite of its etymological significance, strictly denoted "coined money."

With respect to the meaning of *asperena* I must express myself somewhat more fully, since we here come to a point which is of paramount importance in determining the age of the Avesta.

As a matter of course I admit that *asperena* is used to express "value," and that a very trifling one. The word

¹ *Ausland*, 1883, p. 825, (rouble = .86 shilling).

² Vd. IV. 44. Cf. my *O. K. A.* p. 396, note 3, and p. 452, n. 2 (vol. I. p. 221, note 2; *supra* p. 34, n. 2).

³ Yt. XIII. 97. Cf. *hush-hām-beretem-shaetem* in Yt. XVIII. 1.

⁴ *Shaetō-frādhana* occurring side by side with the somewhat synonymous expressions *vāthwō-frādhana* and *gaēthō-frādhāna* in Yt. V. 1; XIII. 4.

occurs twice in our text. We first find, in the fourth Fargard of the Vendidād (48), the expression *asperenō-mazō*, "anything that has the value of an *asperena*," in a rather obscure context, in connection with the terms *anumayo-mazō*, *staorō-mazō*, and *vīrō-mazō*. The second time it occurs, in the fifth Fargard of the Vendidād (60), in a prohibition against the throwing away of a piece of old clothing, even if it be only of the value of an *asperena* or of an *avachina*. Besides, I also admit that *asperena* has the appearance of being a borrowed word introduced into the Avesta language and might be traced, according to Prof. C. de Harlez, to the Semitic root *saphar*, or, according to Prof. Halévy, to *ἄσπρον*. Dr. Justi seems to suggest the Turkish word *asper*.

Now what conclusion may we deduce from what has been said above? The three passages quoted by me from the Avesta—and they are the only ones which directly refer to payments—show clearly that cattle served the Avesta people as a standard of value and as a medium of barter. If then *asperena* really denotes a coin,¹ those passages should not, on that account, be ignored in explaining the text. They retain their value and significance, and we must own that we are here face to face with a paradox, which it is our task to solve. However, we would not be warranted in basing an argument on the expression *asperena* alone, and therefore assigning a recent date to the Avesta; for, it would be quite surprising that this mode of payment in kind should have been preserved as a regular practice side by side with payment in current money. It

¹ But it is also possible that the *asperena* were small rough pieces of metal or some other kind of money (rings or the like), used in barter to make up differences in value. So it is well known that in ancient Rome, when people were still wont to make payments in kind, small pieces of copper were for the same purpose weighed out and circulated.

would, likewise, seem strange that the *asperena* should have been the only coin in use, and that we should hear nothing as to other coins, viz., Dariks and Drachms. At least there is not sufficient ground here to speak of a system of coinage, since such a system must necessarily comprise various coins of different values. Even if we agree to what Dr. Justi believes concerning the word *asperena* and its meaning, yet the passage (48) in the fourth Fargard of the Vendidād, most certainly proves that the *asperena* was used only along with cattle, as a standard of value.

The inconsistency, therefore, does not lie in the employment of cattle as a medium of payment, but in the mention of the *asperena* in the Avesta. If this word is really as modern as it is supposed to be, may we not assume that it was perhaps inserted in the text in a later revision of the Avesta? The motive is easy to understand. In making payments in cattle, the smallest measure of value, the sheep, was after all considerably high. People, therefore, thought it necessary to introduce articles of smaller value, and adopted not only foreign coins, but also their foreign names. This may probably have happened also in old times. The word *asperena*, I believe, must therefore be traced to *sāphar*. Thus we have in *asperena* an instance of a civilized custom adopted by the Irānians from their Semitic neighbours which was almost similar to the old Indian *manā*.¹ Although this idea, which had of course its origin among the Semites, is mentioned in the Rig-veda, it has never occurred to anybody to doubt for that very reason the antiquity of the civilization of the Vedic Arians. Moreover, if relations may be proved to have existed between the Babylonians and the Vedic Indians, it is not to be wondered at if similar relations also existed with the Irānians, who had pushed their way into the district of Raghā.

¹ Comp. Zimmer, *Allindisches Leben*, pp. 50-51.

However that may be, the term *asperena* must not at all be allowed to interfere with the type of civilization, which otherwise appears so conspicuously in the Avesta. If, in this respect, some authors have deduced conclusions of too sweeping a kind, it only indicates how dangerous it is to rely upon an isolated word, ignoring all undoubted passages which afford an unquestionably authentic explanation.¹

We may also observe that neither of the passages, in which the word *asperena* is found, occurs in a succinct context. In both cases, the word or expression might be struck out, without in any way affecting the sense of the whole. The suspicion of a recent insertion is here much more justifiable than in any of the three passages, Vend. IV. 2 seq.; VII. 41 seq.; and IX. 37 seq.

I must now discuss another matter which seems to be important. Other foreign words have been discovered in the Avesta, some of which are supposed to be Aramaic, and some of Greek origin. Prof. Halévy has been kind enough to communicate to me his views on this point, explaining briefly the ideas expressed in his paper read

¹ Dr. Justi goes too far when he says: "Man darf aber hier ein Argument für die Abfassung des Vendidād nicht im Osten sondern im Nordwesten Irāns erkennen, wo der Verkehr mit anderen Völkern fremde Kulturelemente einführte, die dem durch die Wüste getrennten Osten erst spät zukamen." "But we may here find an argument in favour of the theory that the Vendidād was composed not in the East but in the North-West of Irān, where the early intercourse with foreign nations would have introduced foreign elements of civilization, but which could only at a later period have reached the East naturally separated by the deserts." Now, is it possible to suppose that the word *asperena* is of any weight in determining the home of the Avesta! If the word is as modern as Justi indeed assumes, it would at least be odd to think that the elements of Semitic civilization had pressed forward into Eastern Irān.

before the *Société de Linguistique*, wherein he refers to the following expressions:—

I. Words of Aramaic origin: *Tanūra* = תנורא

Naska = נסחא

Gudha = גודא

Guñda = גונדא

Gaesu = γαισον

Asperena = ἀσπρον

Danarc = δηνάριον

Khwaza = χως

II. Words of Greek origin:

Surprising as this list of foreign words may appear, its significance diminishes considerably on closer scrutiny.

In the first place, the word *gudha*—occurring only once in Yasht, XV. 27—seems to be a proper name in the Avesta. Moreover, it belongs apparently to the river district of the Rangha, the Jaxartes. Hence it seems unwarrantable to assert that this word owes its origin to the Semites. Again, some of the manuscripts give the form *gaodha*, instead of *gudha*, which could not be derived from גודא. I am inclined to trace the etymology of the word to the root *gudh*, “to hide.”¹ It is most probable that the name would then designate a river which loses itself entirely in the sand, as occurs very often in Eastern Irān.

The origin of the word *naska* is, likewise, not so well ascertained as would at first sight appear. Its derivation from the Semitic is on the authority of Dr. Spiegel or Dr. Haug.² M. Burnouf, on the contrary, would derive

¹ The Eastern Irānian words *guz* and *gud* would then be related to the Sanskrit *guh*, just as *vaz* and *vad* to *vah*. That the modern *h* was originally a dental, is proved by the Greek *χυδ*, *χεύδω*. The latter can be traced to its primary form *kudh*, which Fick, too, considers to be identical with *guh* (*Wtb.* vol. I. p. 30). Moreover, it should be remembered that the word *gudhra*, “hidden,” is preserved in the Zend-Pahlavi Glossary (Fick, *ibid.* p. 315).

² Comp. Fr. Justi, *Handbuch der Zend-sprache, sub voce*.

the word from the root *nas*, "to annihilate," or, better still, from *naz*, "to unite, to sew." In the latter case we can compare it in meaning with the Sanskrit word *sutra*. So we have here one hypothesis opposed to another, and nobody will assert that the one has greater authority than the other.¹ The same may be said respecting the word *guñda*. Dr. Fr. Müller assigns to it the meaning "plenty," and identifies it with the Armenian *gound*. Prof. Halévy relies on Dr. Müller's theory. But this meaning of "plenty" does not agree with the context. We, therefore, adhere again, as I believe is generally done, to the explanation given by Dr. Spiegel (*Comm.* vol. I. p. 102), who compares it to the Modern Persian words *ghund* and *ghundaih* "*massa farinaria*." Thus with this etymology of *guñda*, too, we may rest confidently within the pale of the Irānian languages.

The identity of *tanūra* with the Hebrew תַּנְעֵר and the Arabic *tannūr*, is beyond question. But must we, on the ground that this word occurs in our text, assign a later origin to the Avesta itself? Certainly not, on any account. It is as difficult to find a satisfactory derivation of the word in Semitic as in Irānian. I, therefore, believe that it is a word as foreign to the one as to the other stock of languages. When we consider that before the progress of the Arian and Semitic civilization, a so-called Turānian one had developed in Anterior Asia, and that these Turānian tribes possessed peculiar skill in the art of working metals, we are justified in assuming that the expression *tanūr*, meaning originally a "smelting furnace," owed its origin to their language and was inherited as a technical term, together with the art of smelting itself, as well by the Irānians as by the Semites. Even granting that *tanūra* can only be

¹ *Naska* occurs only once in the compound form *naskō-frasagh*, but in a passage where it is essential to the metre (Ys. IX. 22). Thus it can, no doubt, be proved from the original text of the Avesta.

explained as a Semitic word, we have still no reason to doubt the great antiquity of the Avesta; for it is not impossible that some civilized intercourse may have existed, though in no considerable degree, in pre-Median times between Mesopotamia and the plateau of Irān.

We must now turn to the words of Greek origin. Of the identity between *ἀσπρον* and *asperena* I have spoken already. The comparison between *khwazha*, or rather I believe *khawzha* or *khavzha*, and *χόος*, is at least very daring. Since, as a rule, every foreign word retains its original form, we should rather expect *khuzha*. Moreover, an apparent etymology for this word is found in the Arian language, and one which, I believe, is universally adopted by Zend scholars. In Sanskrit *khubja* means "crooked." *Khavzha*, then, must have originally meant "the crooked vessel." That this is the correct derivation is proved by the Mod. Persian words *kuz* and *kuzah*, which still mean "crooked" and, at the same time mean "can," "jug," or "bowl."¹

The word *gaesu* has already been very often discussed. Let me refer to Dr. Justi's *Handbuch* as well as to M. Schrader's *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, pp. 327-328. The Greek term *γαύρον* is itself a loan-word of Celtic origin; but it cannot, therefore, be shown that, as a foreign word, it has again passed from the Greeks to the Irānians. It is more probable—and this view is held by no less an authority than M. von Hehn²—that the word *gaesu* is originally Irānian; but at the time of the Celtic migration to Asia Minor, it passed from the Irānians to the Celts and may have, finally, been introduced into Greece at the time of the expedition of Brennus. In support of the priority of this Irānian word one might adduce the fact that M. Tomaschek has discovered an equivalent to *gaesu* in the Sirikuli dialect, in the word *gisk* meaning "club," "cudgel,"

¹ Cf. Spiegel, *Commentar*, vol. I. p. 252; Justi, *Handbuch*, *sub voce*; Vullers, *Lexicon Persico-Latinum*, *sub voce kuz*.

² *Vide Culturpflanzen und Haustiere*, p. 352.

and that, according to M. Bickell, that word may be akin to the Latin *veru*.¹ By no means, then, does it bear the character of a foreign word; on the contrary, it seems to have belonged to the old Irānian language from remote antiquity.

The assumption that the Avesta word *danare* is a paraphrase of δηνάριον and *denarius*, may also be questioned. The very form of the word might rouse suspicion, when we consider that in Modern Persian the last word appears as *dīnār* which, I believe, was originally *dīnnār*. We would expect *dīnāra* or *daenāra*, rather than *danare*. But the Denar is nevertheless a coin, and, as far as I can gather from Dr. Vullers, the Mod. Persian word *dīnār* is also used only in this sense. As a measure of weight it never occurs, as is the case with Dirhem. In the Avesta, however, *danare* must designate a dry measure, or perhaps also a weight; and it is only once mentioned in the Vendīdād, XVI. 7. In this passage we find the rule laid down that a menstruating woman shall receive (daily) *dva danare tāyūininām aēva danare khshāudranām* as food. Dr. Spiegel has latterly noticed (*Comm.* vol. I. p. 363) the similarity between *danare* and δηνάριον, but he, at one time at least, rejected it. He reminds us of the fact that this word is naturally allied to *dāna*, "corn," "wheat," and equivalent to the Sanskrit *dhāna*, Mod. Pers. *dānah*.

Thus we observe that in all cases, where a Greek or Aramaic derivation is assigned to any word, the result is hypothesis opposed to hypothesis. In some instances weighty objections may be raised against the assumption of such derivations. This I must here regard as the principal question. Granted that it were possible to establish an indubitable etymology, still it would constitute no proof against the great age of the Avesta as a whole. Since our record has frequently undergone revisions, all we can do

¹ Tomaschek, *Pamirdialekte*, p. 66; Bickell, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, vol. XII. pp. 438 seq.

is to draw a special conclusion as to the age of the isolated passages in question. I have already suggested this occasionally in discussing the question concerning the word *asperena* as well as under my fourth preliminary remark; and it is surely of peculiar importance when the words concerned are $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$, as is the case, e.g., with *gudha*, *guñda*, *khwazha*, and *naska*. But, even if these words denote measure or weight, we must not ignore the possibility of their having been intentionally altered and adapted to the later conditions of things. I repeat, then, that we ought to be careful not to draw elaborate conclusions as to the history of Irānian civilization from isolated words or passages alone; but we should always see that they do not disagree with other passages in the text.

Now, as regards our last point, that iron was unknown to the early Irānians. So far as I know, none of the scholars who doubt the antiquity of the Avesta, have touched upon this subject. None of them seem to have considered how close an affinity it indicates between the civilization of the Avesta and that of the Rig-veda, between the civilization of the Eastern Irānians and that of the Indians of the Panjāb. And yet the importance of the subject must be evident to all.

The word employed in the Avesta for the metal most commonly in use is *aya᷍h*, corresponding to the Old Indian *ayas*, to the Latin *aes*, and to the Gothic *aiz*. Dr. Zimmer has proved in his *Altindisches Leben* (pp. 51 seq.), that the Vedic *ayas* denotes "brass," i.e., copper-brass, bronze; and, as I believe I have already proved,¹ the corresponding word in the Avesta must have had the same meaning. This is quite apparent from the appellations in which *aya᷍h* is used, and which are strikingly in accord with the Homeric epithets applied

¹ *Vide Ostirānische Kultur*, p. 148:—"The mountain-ranges lying in Central Asia are rich in iron mines, which, according

to $\chi\alpha\kappa\delta\sigma$. Names of metals are constantly alluded to in the Avesta, but among them all none, except *ayaḡh*, could possibly be taken to mean iron. The working of this metal, therefore, was unknown to the Arians of the Avesta. But, is it possible for anybody to maintain that in the latest centuries before Christ the Irānians used as weapons, swords, helmets, clubs, and arrow-heads made of bronze?¹

IV.

Let me now recapitulate the reasons which seem to me to prove the great antiquity of the Avesta. It must be conceded that these are only special arguments, based on isolated passages. But then these are not such passages as do not at the same time form an integral portion of the whole text, and such as might possibly be considered to be a gloss. The majority of my arguments are based upon the Avesta as a whole, and I do not think that the etymology of an isolated word can ever afford sufficient evidence, from which to draw conclusions as to the history of the civilization of a people.

i. The Avesta does not contain any historical description whatever.

to the testimony of the Avesta, existed, likewise, within the *Hara*. From the fact that the metal called *ayaḡh* in the Avesta, was in use for making weapons and chattels, we are not to conclude that here iron alone was meant; rather copper-brass or bronze, which is an alloy of copper and zinc, is referred to. That epithets such as ‘brilliant’ or ‘yellow,’ ‘flame-coloured,’ nay even ‘golden,’ would ever have been applied to iron or steel, is, indeed, scarcely possible; on the contrary, these appellations are quite appropriate in the case of bronze. Likewise, the corresponding word *ayas* in the Rig-veda does not denote iron, but copper-brass, which was far more in use among the Vedic Arians. Copper was also in favour with the Achāians of the Homeric period. Their weapons and vessels were also made of brass which is described, just as in the Avesta, as red and glittering.”

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 24 seq.

2. None of the names of tribes, otherwise in general use, are to be found in it.
3. It contains no allusion to any of the cities of Eastern or Western Irān, celebrated in historic times properly so called, with the exception of Ragha.
4. The economical conditions of the Avesta people are those of a pastoral tribe and of a rural population; and even the priests shared in agricultural pursuits. That such conditions were most highly characteristic of the entire civilized life of the Old Irānian, may be gathered from the general tenor of the Avesta, especially from that of the Gāthās, and more particularly from the nature of the calendar.
5. The primitive character of the Avesta people is evident from their ignorance of the use of (*a*) salt, (*b*) glass, (*c*) coined money, and (*d*) iron.

Finally, I must now notice some other arguments, from which it might perhaps be inferred that the Avesta was composed in a late period. Of these, the most noteworthy have been adduced by Prof. C. de Harlez in his excellent "Introduction" to the second edition of his translation of the Avesta (H. 1, pp. cxcii. seq.; cf. H. 4, pp. 494-495):¹

¹ This book is unfortunately very little known in Germany. In size and contents, it forms a work by itself, an encyclopædia of the Avesta. I only regret that I did not make use of it while writing my *Ostirānische Kultur*.

I. The modern forms of the names of places mentioned in the first Fargard of the Vendidād. Here we find *Bākhdi* for *Bākhtri*; *Mouru* for *Marghu*. Prof. Harlez also refers to *Bawri* for *Babiru* and *Raji* for *Ragha*. As regards the last two, Bawri need not be taken into account, for, being a name, it is quite possible that it may have been incorrectly written.¹ *Rajōit* occurs only in Yasna, XIX.

18. Since, without exception, we meet with the regular form *Ragha* in other passages, and since even in the passage quoted it immediately follows *Rajōit*, I believe I am right in conjecturing that this form is an appellative, possibly meaning "kingdom, dominion"; otherwise, its spelling should be altered.

However, an argument based on the modern character of forms of geographical names occurring in the Avesta, is not very cogent. In its general aspect the Avesta, as few have it, does not seem to be the work originally written by some of the first Zoroastrians, but a transcript bearing very plain traces of revision. What, therefore, is more probable than that, in such a revision, the geographical names in the original should have been adapted to the forms of those names then current?²

Even Dr. Spiegel says: "I have often had occasion to remark that I attach no importance to any linguistic proofs; for, even granting that we can prove that its language is primeval, one might nevertheless endeavour to find an expedient and must assume that the book was written

¹ Halévy informs me through a letter that *Bawri* might correspond to the Aramaic בָּרְיָה. In that case this word, like *Mouru*, must be regarded as an adaptation of the old to the modern form of the name due to a later revision of the Avesta.

² *Bākhdi*, at least, must be regarded as a corrupt form, since there was no period in the history of Irānian languages, when the *r* could have dropped out of the name *Baktra*. Even to the present day the city is called Balkh.

after the language had ceased to be used, since internal evidence obliges us to ascribe to the book a comparatively later date."¹ We may certainly say with equal justice: since the internal evidence of the Avesta is in favour of its high antiquity, while the language often exhibits some modern forms, we must assume a revision of the Avesta after its language had ceased to be spoken.

II. In the fourth Fargard of the Vendidād (47 seq.) abstemiousness, homelessness, celibacy, and prohibition against eating flesh are inveighed against. This passage must have been directed against the gradual encroachments of Buddhism, the representative of which is the Gautama mentioned in Yasht, XIII. 16.

Now, let me request Zend scholars to examine the passage which bears upon this question. Nobody will assert that we can with certainty regard it as a polemic against Buddhism. We could at best, and with all due reservation, consider this view as a mere conjecture, on the basis of which it would be quite dangerous to form any conclusion as to the history of Irānian civilization.

The text runs thus:—

*Adhacha · uiti · nāirivaitē · zi · tē · ahmāt · pourum · fram-
raoimi · Spitama · Zarathushtra · yatha · maghavo-fra-
vākhshōit, vīsānē · ahmat · yatha · evīsāi, puthrānē · ahmat ·
yatha · aputhrāi, shaetavatō · ahmat · yatha · ashaetāi, hāucha ·
ayā · nara · vohu · manō · jāgerebushtarō · aīhat · yō · gēush ·
uruthware · hāmpafrāiti · yatha · hāu · yō · nōit · itha.*

¹ "Ich habe öfter Gelegenheit gehabt zu bemerken, dass ich auf den sprachlichen Beweis nichts gebe; denn gesetzt auch, es liesse sich nachweisen, dass die Sprache uralt sei, so würde man doch nach einem Auskunftsmittel suchen und etwa annehmen müssen, das Awestā sei nach dem Aussterben der Sprache geschrieben, falls innere Gründe uns nötigen, das Buch einer späteren Periode zuzuschreiben."

Prof. Harlez himself translates it:—¹

"Je proclame pour toi qui a une épouse, ô saint Zoroastre, la priorité sur celui qui n'en use point; pour le chef de maison, sur celui qui n'en possède point; pour le père de famille, sur celui qui n'a pas d'enfants; pour le possesseur de terres sur celui qui n'en a point. Celui qui nourrit et développe (son corps) en mangeant de la viande, obtient le bon esprit bien mieux que celui qui ne le fait pas."

First let me remark that the whole passage, and especially the connection with what follows, is obscure. Prof. Harlez has certainly translated the concluding portion of the passage incorrectly. According to his opinion, *geush* ought to be considered as instrumental; however, it is not possible. It could often be rendered "he who fills the body of the cattle," i.e., whoever feeds them.² This passage, therefore, implies a meaning common in the Avesta, viz., that cattle-breeding is a meritorious work. And such is the clear interpretation of the passage:—"Such a man possesses more of the good-mind (*vohu-manō*) than one who does not do it." *Vohu-manō*, the genius of the good-mind, is, according to the Zoroastrian teaching, also the protector of herds.

Again, the beginning of the passage, which contains the antithesis, *nāirivat* and *maghavō-fravākhshi*, is not quite

¹ [Avesta traduit, 2nd ed. p. 48: "I proclaim for you who have a spouse, O holy Zoroaster! the priority over him who has none; for the head of a household, over him who possesses none; for the *pater-familias*, over him who has no offspring; for the owner of land, over him who owns no piece of ground. He who nourishes and develops (his body) by eating meat, acquires the good mind, far better than he who does it not." (Vd. IV. 47-48). Tr. n.]

² Uruthware translated "body, stomach." If, according to Harlez, this word signifies "growth," the passage implies: "Whoever furthers the growth of cattle." Thus the meaning is not changed. Here Geldner agrees with me (Vide Studien zum Avesta, p. 5).

clear. At all events this much seems to be manifest; that the man, who lives in lawful marriage, should be preferred to any one who satisfies his desires in other ways. According to the whole tenor of the Avesta, it cannot seem strange that a man who lives in a village community, who brings up children, makes for himself a household and becomes the possessor of fields and herds, is more deserving in the eyes of a Zoroastrian than one who fails to do so. Let us only bear in mind how the possession of children is always looked upon as a direct blessing of God,¹ and compare therewith what I have already said with reference to the meritoriousness of a settled country-life according to the testimony of the Avesta.

What conclusion, then, must we draw from Vendidād, IV. 47-48, without doing violence to its meaning? Simply this, that the Avesta frequently alludes to the contrast between civilized and uncivilized life, especially between the life of settled herdsmen and peasants and that of nomads. That this is the correct interpretation is emphatically shown by the use of the antonymous words *vīsānē* and *evisāi*. The peasant and the herdsman live in permanent villages (*vīsō*), the nomad on the contrary knows no settled life.

Moreover, as regards *Gaotama*, who is supposed to be the representative of Buddhism, which forced its way into Irān, the name only occurs once in Yt. XIII. 16. Prof. Westergaard, however, reads *gaotema*, and gives also the variant *gaotuma* in two other MSS., but never *gaotama*.² This is important, since Prof. Harlez expressly says:—

La forme gaotama est le produit d'une transcription faite à l'ouïe et non d'une dérivation naturelle. Thus *gaotama* might certainly be regarded as a simple misspelling of

¹ Cf. my *O. K. A.* pp. 234-236 (vol. I. pp. 53-54).

² [“The form Gaotama is due to a transcription based on sound and not to any indigenous derivation.” *Tr.*]

the Indian name, *Gaotama Buddha*; but *Gaotema* is purely Irānian.¹

To this it is to be added that the passage cited above is obscure. Prof. C. de Harlez himself observes (*Avesta Traduit*, 2nd ed. p. 481): “phrase entièrement obscure.” Again, the translations of the passage do not at all agree. Passing over Dr. Spiegel’s, I shall quote here Prof. Geldner’s version (*Metrik des jüngeren Avesta*, pp. 80-81): “Through their power and greatness a man is born skilled in counsel, an adviser, whose words are heard with willingness, who is looked to for instruction, who hears complacently the request of his weaker proteges.”

But, if, in spite of the “phrase entièrement obscure,” we were to regard Prof. Harlez’s translation: “*L’homme naît, intelligent, manifestant ses pensées, entendant bien ce que l’on dit, en qui est déposée l’intelligence, qui échappe aux questions de méchant Gaotama,*”² as correct, what could we reasonably gather from the passage? This certainly, that the Fravasis will allow one to be born, who is to be a match for a certain Gautema in argument. Now, if we consider that learned controversies were evidently not unknown to the Avesta priests—for instance in the legend of *Yāsta Fryāna* and his dispute with *Akhyā* in Yt. V. 83;—if we, again, consider that the name *gaotema* is purely Irānian and can be clearly traced to the remotest Arian period, since the Rig-veda, too, speaks of a singer *gotama*, the passage is divested of all possible reference to Buddhism.

III. In Yt. XIX. 18, Ragha is called a city, in which the Athravans were possessed of temporal power. But such

¹ As far as I know, it was Haug who first started the theory that Yasht, XIII. 16 contained an allusion to Buddhism (cf. “Essays on the Parsis,” 2nd ed. by West, p. 208, note).

² [“The man is born intelligent, manifesting his thoughts, well understanding what is said, in whom is placed the intelligence that solves the questions put by the perverse Gaotama.” *Tr.*]

a sovereignty of the Magi existed in Irān only after the close of the dominion of the Seleucidae. Consequently, this passage must have been written only at that period.

This brings us to a very important question. There is no doubt that even Dr. Spiegel (Sp. 1, pp. 9-10, Sp. 2, pp. 629-635), has, on the authority of this passage, formed a peculiar theory concerning the home as well as the age of the Avesta, the only ground for which lies in the fact that the passage has been variously interpreted so as to lose its original meaning.

I must here consider Prof. Harlez's Introduction, which thoroughly explains the relation of the Avesta Āthravans to the Magi known to us from history.

This learned translator of the Avesta maintains, in the first place, that the Achaemenian kings were not familiar with the Avesta religion. On the contrary, all that we know about the Magi allows us to assert that their doctrines and their customs were perfectly identical with those which we find recorded in the Avesta. To this must also be added that Khosru Parviz (531-579 A.D.) in a proclamation given in the Dinkard, says:—“que Vishtūspa fit réunir tous les ouvrages écrits en la langue des Mages pour acquérir la connaissance de la loi mazdéene.”¹ Since it seems hardly possible that a country of so little importance as Bactriana should have given to the West a sacred language and religion, Prof. C. de Harlez concludes: “La solution la plus simple et la plus naturelle serait d'attribuer l'Avesta aux Mages et à la Médie.”² (H. 1, p. xlvi.)

The assertion that Bactriana was “toujours soumise et

¹ [“That Vishtāspa caused all the works written in the language of the Magi to be collected in order to acquire the knowledge of the Mazdian law.” *Tr.*]

² [“The solution would be the simplest and most natural if we should ascribe the Avesta to the Magi and to Media.” *Tr.*]

*peu important*¹ can hardly be correct. The large revenue obtained from this province in the time of the Achaemenian kings, proves at least that it was highly prosperous.² That its population formed no inconsiderable part, but rather the main portion, of the Irānian people, is most clearly proved by the energetic opposition offered to Alexander the Great precisely in the North-Eastern provinces of the Persian empire. Moreover, I must here repeat that, in determining the home of the Avesta religion generally, the question is not one respecting Bactria alone but the whole of Eastern Irān.

Again, we cannot attach much value to the statement that Khosru Parviz characterizes the Avesta language as

¹ "Always subject to a foreign ruler, and of little importance."

² [Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. IV. ch. 5, pp. 18-19. *Vide* Eng. ed. bk. VII. ch. II. pp. 23-24: "The nations and condition of Eastern Irān can be ascertained more clearly from the inscriptions of Darius. According to his inscription at Behistun, his empire in that direction comprised the Parthians, Sarangians, Areians, Chorasmians, Bactrians, Sogdiani, Gandarii, Sattagydae, Arachoti, and Sacae; and to these the Idhus, *i.e.*, the Indians on the right bank of the upper course of the Indus, are added in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Naksh-i-Rustam. Further information is preserved by Herodotus with respect to the tribute imposed by Darius on these nations. As these statements are undoubtedly derived from Persian tribute-lists, they serve to throw a side-light on the state of civilization existing in the East of Irān at the division of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. The Bactrians, the twelfth satrapy of the empire, paid (yearly) 360 (Babylonian) talents into the treasury of the king. These sums, which do not include the whole of the burdens of the provinces, but are only the land-taxes which they had to pay—in addition tolls were levied and contributions in kind to the court of the king and the satraps, as well as for the maintenance of the army—show that at the time of Darius agriculture and wealth had proceeded far beyond the earliest stages in the eastern districts of Irān. The Babylonian silver talent amounted to more than 2,000 thalers (6,000 shillings)."] Tr. n.]

the language of the Magi. There is no doubt that under the Sassanidae the Magi were the representatives of the Zoroastrian priesthood; but by this time the Avesta language had long been dead and had been succeeded in general use by the Middle Irānian. If, then, the Magi alone still understood this language, if they used it in their daily ceremonies, prayers, and recitations, and if it completely swayed the *cult* upheld by the Magi, it might well be called, for the sake of convenience, the "language of the Magi." Consequently, it is characterized as the language of a single order, not as that of a nation, just as Latin in the Middle Ages might be called the language of *literati* or Modern French the language of diplomacy.

Moreover, I generally accept the view of Prof. Harlez: The Achaemenian kings, and for the most part the Persian nation itself, did *not* profess the Zoroastrian religion. It is represented in historical times by the Median Magi, through whose influence it strove to gain ground among the majority of the Persians under the sovereignty of the Achaemenidae. But hence it has been inferred only of late, that the Magi composed the Avesta known to us, and that Zarathushtra himself was a Magus. This is only one of three possibilities. Besides this there are two other credible suppositions:—(a) The Magi adopted the doctrine of the Zoroastrian priests, thus representing a later phase in the development of the Avesta religion. (b) The Zoroastrian priests are the heirs of the Magi.

The last possibility we may briefly dismiss. We can trace the history of the Magi down to the Sāssānian period. But nowhere do we find any reference to a belief that they had delegated their peculiar office to another religious corporation, which revered the Zoroastrian doctrine and perhaps only transferred the scene of their labours to a different field.

As regards Prof. Harlez's theory that the Avesta was composed by the Magi and in Media, a very important

fact seems to contradict it. The Avesta priests are not strictly called *Maghu* but *Athravans*. In all passages where the priests are mentioned, they invariably bear this name; and such passages are not few in number. Their testimony would lead us to infer that "*Athravan*," and in fact this title exclusively, served as the official designation of the priesthood. Why then should the Magi in their own writings have given to themselves any other name than that by which they were universally known to the world?

Now, in a passage in the Avesta (Ys. LXV. 6) there, indeed, occurs the expression *moghu-tbish* and this must be taken into consideration.¹ But what does it prove? At the very most, only this, that, at the time when this passage was composed, the term *Maghu* was not unknown and perhaps was almost synonymous with *Athravan*. The fact that *Athravan* was the *real title* of the Avesta priesthood, is not in the least affected by the use of the term *Maghu*. Had the Magi really been the authors of the Avesta, their own title, instead of appearing only in a single isolated passage, and that the least important, would have been used throughout the work.

Moreover, it seems quite possible that, in the passage referred to, *Maghu* bears a purely generic meaning. If we compare it with the Sanskrit *maghavan*, the word can be translated "protector, or feudal lord, prince, nobleman." *Moghu-tbish* occurs especially in Ys. LXV. 6, side by side with *hashē-tbish*, *varezānō-tbish*, *nāfyō-tbish*, "the hatred of friends, free commoners or countrymen, and of relations." These expressions are all generic terms, and we must of course admit that the context does not compel us to adopt

¹ Cf. H. 2, p. 171; also my *O. K. A.* pp. 489-492, (*vide supra* pp. 80-84). It will be observed that I have altered the views expressed in my *Ostirānische Kultur*, since I have there attempted to adopt a middle course.

the rendering of "priest" for *Maghu*, which is possible, though not always exclusively appropriate.

But we may ask, which of the two designations *Maghu* or *Atharvan* (*Āthravan*) seems to be the older one? *Atharvan* admits of a direct connection with the Vedic civilization. In the Rig-veda, too, we find the word *Atharvan* used to mean "a fire-priest," as well as the name of a mythical character, the Prometheus of the Indians, who brings down fire from heaven, and is thus the prototype of all fire-priests on earth.¹ The title *Atharvan* may, consequently, be traced to the remote Arian period; at the same time we can only discover Indian words, indeed analogous to *Maghu*, but not quite identical with it.

Thus all evidence goes to show that *Atharvan* was the oldest and most original title of the Zoroastrian priesthood. Gradually, as the centre of gravity of the Irānian nation moved from East to West, as the Indian tribe of the Magi assumed the direction of religious matters, its name, which had an ethnographical significance at first, became at the same time the title of the priesthood formed by that tribe.

The Avesta, therefore, does not recognize the term *Maghu* as the title of the Zoroastrian priests; it never designates them by any other name than that of *Āthrvans*. On this point, even at the present day, a futile attempt is made to urge another passage from our text in support of the Median and Magian origin of the

¹ Comp. my *Ostirānische Kultur*, pp. 464-465, (*supra* pp. 48-49). It cannot, however, be proved that the title *Atharvan* is strictly meant by the name *πύραιδοι* by which, according to Strabo (p. 733, where also the Cappadocians are specially mentioned), the Magi are supposed to have called themselves. Nevertheless, it does not do away with the fact that *Maghu* is unknown to the Avesta as the title of its priesthood (H. 2, p. 171).

Avesta. This much-disputed passage (Ys. XIX. 18) runs as follows¹ :—

"Who are the chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the country-prince, the fifth is the *Zarathushtra*. (So it is) excepting the *Zarathushtrian Ragha*. Who are (here) the chiefs? The master of the house, the lord of the village, the president of the tribe, the fourth is the *Zarathushtra*."

What we may safely infer from the above passage is, that, at the time it was written, a kind of Zoroastrian papacy existed in Irān. To the High-priest was then assigned a rank higher than that of the country-princes. In Ragha he evidently possessed temporal as well as spiritual dignity. The High-priest of Ragha was at the same time its prince.

In the first place, however, it may be observed that the passage contains no personal reference to Zarathushtra; accordingly, it cannot serve as an argument in support of the theory that the Avesta was composed by the Medes. Apparently, *Zarathushtra* here is not a proper name but a generic term; it is the title of the head of the Zoroastrian priesthood. In the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta we find *Zaratushtum*, "the highest Zarathushtra."

Secondly, we must not bring the contents of the passage in Yasna, XIX. 18, to bear on the whole period of the civilization of the Avesta people. Moreover, there are

¹ Spiegel has discussed this passage in his *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. III. p. 563; also Sp. I, pp. 9-10; Sp. 2, pp. 630-632. But, I believe, he is wrong, when, in connection with this passage, he quotes the epithet *thrizañtu*, which Ragha receives in Vd. I. 16. *Zañtu* cannot possibly mean "order." It means always "tribe, race," and *thrizañtu* must imply that three Irānian tribes had settled in the district (*dāñhu*) of Ragha.

many other passages¹ besides this, which enumerate the different lords, but in none of them is the *Zarathushtrōtema* directly mentioned.² The superiority of the priesthood over the two other orders of warriors and farmers appears so very conspicuously throughout the Avesta, and so much attention is drawn to it by its author, that it is hardly possible he could have failed to emphasize the rank of the high-priest of Ragha beyond that of the tribal chiefs and the country-princes.

But it is quite unwarrantable to identify the temporal power of *Zarathushtra* in Ragha with the dignity of the Grand Magus in Rai, (Sp. 2, pp. 629-630). Such a theory fails in the most important point of our argument; the Avesta speaks only of the Āthravans and not of the Magi. It calls the high-priest of Ragha, *Zarathushtra* or *Zarathushtrōtema*, a title which is never given to the *Masmaghāns*. To this it must be added that the only authorities for the dignity of the Grand Magus in Rai, are Albērūnī and Yāqūt, and that the period in which it originated cannot, therefore, be ascertained. In determining the age of the Avesta, the reference to the *Masmaghān* must, in any case, prove of little value. For, if the Magi were the heirs and successors of the Zoroastrian Āthravans,—a fact which must at least be generally admitted as possible—the *Masmaghān* to a certain extent would be a later development of the *Zarathushtrōtema* whose dignity might then be traced probably to the pre-historic epoch.

But I believe that we are not justified in laying too much stress on the passage, Ys. XIX. 18. We must not suppose

¹ Cf. Yt. X. 18, 83; Vd. X. 5; Vsp. III. 2, &c.

² Gāh, IV. 6-7. Here we meet with the following expressions in invocations and hymns of praise:—*Zarathushtrōtema*, *zara-thushtra*, *āthravan*, *rathaeshtar*, *vāstrya-fshuyās*, *nmānō-paiti*, *vīspaiti*, *zañtu-paiti*, *dāñhu-paiti*. From this we should gather that *Zarathushtra* as well as *Zarathushtrōtema* was a priestly title.

that during the greatest part of the Avesta epoch there existed any such half-spiritual, half-temporal power in Ragha. Who knows when this isolated passage was composed and when it was introduced into the text? Had Ragha really played so important a part in the Zoroastrian commonwealth, it is strange that this city is named only in two passages in the whole Avesta, viz., (1) in the passage cited above, and (2) in the list of countries enumerated in the Vendidad. *Haitumat* is mentioned three times; *Haraiva* and *Moru* twice; whilst such places as *Aryana-vaija*, the *Hara-berzati*, the *Ardvi-sura*, and also the *Rangha*, are frequently mentioned. Surely nobody will be inclined to assert that in the Avesta opportunities could not have offered themselves for mentioning Ragha and the high-priest residing in it.¹

IV. The Avesta commends next-of-kin marriage as a meritorious institution. But this practice, according to Herodotus, III. 34, was only introduced by Cambyses. The Avesta, therefore, cannot have been composed until after Cambyses.

I believe that we should not press too far this assertion of Herodotus, which has the air of an anecdote. It is of course improbable that such an institution could have been introduced, in an age of relatively high civilization, by the mere edict of a single individual, and even obtain recognition as a moral law. How could the Median Magi have reconciled themselves to the thought of adopting such an innovation, in opposition to their usual practice, at the time when, as Prof. Harlez assumes, they were opposed to the

¹ Other passages of the Avesta have been pointed out (*cf.* O. K. A. pp. 489-490; *vide* above pp. 81-82) from which we can infer that the Āthravans "came from afar" and led a wandering life. This may be true even of several districts, and of certain portions of the Zoroastrian priesthood; but it does not follow hence that the Āthravans were identical with the Magi and had emigrated from West to East.

Persians? It is, however, far more probable that they would have used such an innovation as a ground of opposition to the king. The statement of Herodotus has, apparently, no other object than to give an explanation of some kind or other for an existing custom naturally unfamiliar to him. It certainly has no historical value. Moreover, it must be added that Herodotus expressly says:—Οὐδαμῶς γὰρ ἐώδεσαν πρότερον τῆσι ἀδελφεῖσι συνοιχέειν Πέρσαι. At the most we can only consider the innovation of Cambyses as affecting the Persians, a fact which cannot in the least influence the question whether the Median Magi had already in olden times recognized and approved of the marriage of relations.

I can dispose with equal ease of the next objection set forth by Prof. Harlez.

V. The fifth Yasht could not have been written before the introduction of the *cult* of the *Anaiti* by Artaxerxes Mnemon. The description which comprehends the outward figure and garments of that *yazata* in the Yasht, seems to be exactly that of a statue of Anaïti.

This conclusion is evidently erroneous. Granted that Artaxerxes II. (404-361) had actually introduced the cult of the Anaïti, his action could have reference to Persia alone. Again, the Median Magi, who, according to Prof. Harlez, endeavoured during the sovereignty of the Achæmenidae to propagate their religion over the whole of Irān, might have worshipped their Anāhita many centuries before. But, as far as I know, it is nowhere asserted that Artaxerxes II. first instituted this cult. Berosus alone relates that Artaxerxes II. was the first to set up images of the Aphrodite Anaïti in different towns, and that before this the divine beings were never represented in Irān in any shape whatever.¹ Thus we have here only a question of the

¹ Clemens Alex. *Admonit. Adv. Gentes.* Comp. Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. II. p. 56, note 1.

erection of statues and especially of that of Aphrodite Anaïti, that is, of a female deity in whose worship the old Irānian conceptions were blended with Semitic ideas.

Then, as regards the description of Anāhita given in the fifth Yasht (par. 126-129), it is more probable that the later images of Anāhita were adapted to such frequent delineations, than the reverse. Every image must, however, first exist in the mind before it can receive material expression. Again, Prof. Harlez's theory is not justified by the opening words *yā hishtaiti* "which stands in a certain place." This is sufficiently manifest from the glowing character and internal evidence of the whole description, which is an effort to describe in life-like terms the form of that *yazata*.

VI. I have already spoken briefly of the linguistic evidence adduced by Prof. Harlez in the sixth passage. Dr. Spiegel, too, admits that we are not justified in laying any stress upon it. We should also reject it on the ground that the Avesta, as we have it, cannot be supposed to be exactly in its original condition. And, in fact, this is confirmed not merely by the Zend Grammar in which many forms adapted from modern dialects may be often observed, but also by the mere form and spelling of the words.¹

VII. The persecutions alluded to in the Gāthās refer to the persecutions of the Magi by king Darius.

This view is opposed by the whole tone and tenour of the Gāthās. Prof. Harlez has overlooked the fact that the opposition here described does not merely imply the conflict between two different religious factions or sects,

¹ In this respect the circumstance that the Avesta, as it seems to be assumed generally, was originally written in a different and ambiguous alphabet, similar to the Pahlavi, must have had a peculiarly injurious effect on the form of the text. We may thus account for the vagueness in the nature and constitution of the vowels, for the different ways of writing the *guna* forms, and the interchange of long and short vowels, &c.

but at the same time that between two different epochs of the economic history of the Avesta people. On the dispute between Darius and the Magi hinged, however, the question of legal power and not that of economical grievances. Let us only read the twenty-ninth chapter of the Yasna. In fact, I do not understand how the cow can become the representative of the Magi and pray for them to Ahura Mazda for their deliverance from the oppressions of Darius. Nor can I conceive how the appearance of Zarathushtra could be the promised help they had in view. That would be true, however, for the Magi of the Achaemenian period *tempi passati*. Moreover, all this is easily explained on the supposition that the hymn in question relates to the herdsmen and agriculturists of Eastern Irān, who were oppressed by the nomads of the steppes, and was composed in the age of Zarathushtra.¹ The Prophet may have been honoured as the principal defender of the menaced peasantry or country-people.

How can we account for the absence of all historical references in the Gāthās which allude to so many incidents of real life? Are we to suppose that the author must have taken special care to avoid every hint which might enlighten the reader or the hearer as to what is particularly referred to? The names of opponents, however, could not

¹ I cannot at all conceive why Zarathushtra should not be regarded as a historical personage; historical, of course, in the sense in which Lycurgus is historical. Much less can I believe in a "mythological" connection with the Rig-veda, which Dr. Spiegel believes he has established by deriving the name *Spitama* from the root *spit*, and by identifying it with the Vedic *çvitrā*. But all this proves only an etymological affinity, as well as the use of the root *çvit* by Indians and Irānians in the formation of proper names; but certainly nothing more. The name Spitama can be traced historically in Irān. Let us only consider the name Spitamenes, and we are reminded of the fact that he was an Eastern Irānian! Cf. Sp. I, pp. 8-9.

have been omitted, nor the honourable mention of the most faithful of the Magi. But the reverse is the case in the Gāthās. Here there is only a general record of the opposition between what is good and what is evil, between the believing and the unbelieving, so that we can obtain no definite knowledge of the personages concerned; or, where the narrative treats of real life, the object of all enmity, all care, prayers and apprehensions is nothing else than the cow.

As the last argument in support of the modern origin of the Avesta, Prof. Harlez alleges the words of foreign origin, which only found their way at some later period into the language. I have already discussed this question above, and, with the assistance of M. Halévy, more fully in fact than Prof. Harlez himself has done.

In conclusion I have to make two more observations.

It might perhaps strike the reader that I have not here touched upon the theory which supposes the Vishtāspa of the Avesta to be merely identical with the father of Darius Hystaspes. I did not mention it, not because it has found scarcely any supporters, but because of another reason which is, indeed, a very simple one. There are not two opinions as to the identity of the two names, Vishtāspa and Hystaspes; but such an identity cannot, therefore, be used as a proof in determining the question of the age of the Avesta, since it does not at all involve any identification of the personages to whom the names belong. History tells us of several Hystaspes. But that the father of Darius must have been the very prince named in the Avesta, who embraccd the doctrine of Zarathushtra, is by no means proved. It is merely a possibility, an hypothesis, which requires to be independently proved. Moreover, a proof in support of it could only be supplied by first endeavouring to determine the date of the Avesta from internal evidence. This theory, therefore, cannot form a link in the chain of arguments for or against the great

antiquity of the Avesta, for this reason, that it is only an assumption. It is more likely that, according to the result arrived at from those arguments, the question as to the relation of Vishtāspa to Hystaspes might open out a new field for investigation. In my opinion, it is evident that the Vishtāspa of the Avesta has nothing in common with the father of Darius but the name, which both may have shared with several other Irānians.

Finally, it is sometimes asserted that the Avesta can be of no great antiquity, because the doctrines and ideas contained in it are too noble and elevated to have been developed among the Avesta people, who had not passed the primitive stage of civilization. Such general assertions cannot of course be proved or contradicted. It is more or less a question of taste. Moreover, I believe, that such assertions would lead one to overestimate the sublimity of the Avesta conceptions as regards the Spirit. The æsthetic value of the Avesta is generally supposed to be far below that of the Rig-veda. But it must be remembered that the Vedic Arians were as conspicuous for their poetic ideas and artistic taste, as the Irānians were distinguished for their profound moral virtues. This might also easily be explained from the physical condition of the Irānian soil, which necessarily accustomed its inhabitants to a rigid ideal of life, to hard work and industry, which, though it probably restrained the flight of fancy, nevertheless ennobled human nature.

Who, again, can say how far the personal influence of the founder of the Avesta religion may have reached? The intellectual development of man cannot be regulated at will. If it seems to stagnate for centuries, it often, on the contrary, makes gigantic strides in one single generation, and that, too, owing to the personal influence of a single individual.

The question as regards the home and age of the Avesta is at present the standing difficulty of Irānian Philology,

and will, I surmise, remain so for a long time. I shall be content with what little I can contribute towards the legitimate solution, which must eventually discover the truth.

So long as no new and convincing reasons are adduced on the other side, so long as the arguments I have striven to bring together in my work remain unrebutted, I repeat, in concluding this treatise, the convictions with which I set out, namely, that:—

1. The home of the Avesta civilization was really Eastern Irān, the land of the Syr-daryā westward towards the frontiers of Media and southward to the deserts of Gedrosia.
2. The Avesta civilization dates from a very remote antiquity. It is fruitless to specify a particular century. But there is no doubt that it is older than Medo-Persian history.

[This opinion of Dr. Geiger has been ably supported by the accomplished Avesta scholar, Dr. Karl Geldner, in his dissertation (*vide* "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th ed. vol. XVIII. p. 653) on the old Irānian languages and literature, from which I extract the following:—

Persian (Irānian) Languages.

"The Irānian family of languages is one of the seven great branches of the Indo-European stem, and was first recognized as such by Sir William Jones and Friedrich Schlegel. Whatever uncertainty still remains as to the exact relationship between all the several branches of the Indo-European family, it is at least certain that Indian

and Persian belong together more closely than the rest, and that they continued to develop side by side for a long period after the other branches had been already severed from the parent stem."

* * * * *

"Our knowledge of the Irānian languages in older periods is too fragmentary to allow of our giving a complete account of this family and of its special historical development. It will be sufficient here to distinguish the main types of the older and the more recent periods. From antiquity we have sufficient knowledge of two dialects, the first belonging to Eastern Irān, the second to Western."

i. *Zend*, or *Old Bactrian*.—“Neither of these two titles is well chosen. The name Old Bactrian suggests that the language was limited to the small district of Bactria, or at least that it was spoken there; which is, at the most, only an hypothesis. Zend, again (originally *Āzaintish*), is not the name of a language, as Anquetil Duperron supposed, but means “interpretation” or “explanation,” and is specially applied to the medieval Pahlavi translation of the *Avesta*. Our “*Zend-Avesta*” does not mean the *Avesta* in the Zend language, but is an incorrect transcription of the original expression “*Avisták-va-Zand*,” i.e., “the holy text (*Avesta*) together with the translation.” But, since we still lack sure data to fix the home of this language with any certainty, the convenient name of Zend has become generally established in Europe, and may be provisionally retained. But the home of the Zend language was certainly in Eastern Irān; all attempts to seek it farther West—e.g., in Media¹—must be regarded as failures.

¹ Cf. J. Darmesteter, *Etudes Iraniques*, I. p. 10, (Paris, 1883).

"Zend is the language of the so-called *Avesta*,¹ the holy book of the Persians, containing the oldest documents of the religion of Zoroaster. Besides this important monument, which is about twice as large as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* put together, we only possess very scanty relics of the Zend language in medieval glosses and scattered quotations in Pahlavi books. These remains, however, suffice to give a complete insight into the structure of the language. Not only amongst Irānian languages, but amongst all the languages of the Indo-European group, Zend takes one of the very highest places in importance for the comparative philologist. In age it almost rivals Sanskrit; in primitiveness it surpasses that language in many points; it is inferior only in respect of its less extensive literature, and because it has not been made the subject of systematic grammatical treatment. The age of Zend must be examined in connexion with the age of the Avesta. In its present form the *Avesta* is not the work of a single author or of any one age, but embraces collections produced during a long period. The view which became current through Anquetil Duperron, that the *Avesta* is throughout the work of Zoroaster (in Zend, *Zarathushtra*), the founder of the religion, has long been abandoned as untenable. But the opposite view, which is now frequently accepted, that not a single word in the book can lay claim to the authorship of Zoroaster, also appears on closer study too sweeping. In the Avesta two stages of the language are plainly distinguishable, for which the supposition of local dialectic variation is not sufficient explanation, but

¹ As was said above, this, and not *Zend-Avesta*, is the correct title for the original text of the Persian Bible. The origin of the word is doubtful, and we cannot point to it before the time of the Sassanians. Perhaps it means "announcement," "revelation."

which appear rather to be an older and a younger stage in the development of the same language. The older is represented in but a small part of the whole work, the so-called *Gāthās* or songs. These songs form the true kernel of the book Yasna;¹ they must have been in existence long before all the other parts of the *Avesta*, throughout the whole of which allusions to them occur. These *Gāthās* are what they claim to be, and what they are honoured in the whole *Avesta* as being—the actual productions of the Prophet himself or of his time. They bear in themselves irrefutable proofs of their authenticity, bringing us face to face not with the Zoroaster of the legends but with a real person, announcing a new doctrine and way of salvation, no supernatural Being assured of victory, as he is represented in later times, but a mere man, often himself despairing of his final success, and struggling not with spirits and demons but with human obstacles of every sort, in the midst of a society of fellow-believers which was yet feeble and in its earliest infancy. It is almost impossible that a much later period could have produced such unpretentious and almost depreciatory representations of the deeds and personality of the Prophet; certainly nothing of the kind is found out of the *Gāthās*. If, then, the *Gāthās* reach back to the time of Zoroaster, and he himself, according to the most probable estimate, lived as early as the 14th century B.C., the oldest component parts of the *Avesta* are hardly inferior in age to the oldest Vedic hymns. The *Gāthās* are still extremely rough in style and expression; the language

¹ The *Avesta* is divided into three parts; (1) *Yasna*, with an appendix, *Visparad*, a collection of prayers and formulas for divine service; (2) *Vendidād*, containing direction for purification and the penal code of the ancient Persians; (3) *Khordah-Avesta*,

is richer in forms than the more recent Zend; and the vocabulary shows important differences. The predominance of the long vowels is a marked characteristic, the constant appearance of a long final vowel contrasting with the preference for a final shoot in the later speech.

Sanskrit.	Gāthā.	Later Zend.
abhi (near)	aibi	aiwi.
īhá (work)	īzhá	izha.

"The clearest evidence of the extreme age of the language of the Gāthās is its striking resemblance to the oldest Sanskrit, the language of the Vedic poems. The *Gāthā* language (much more than the later Zend) and the language of the *Vedas* have a close resemblance, exceeding that of any two Romanic languages; they seem hardly more than two dialects of one tongue. Whole strophes of the Gāthās can be turned into good old Sanskrit by the application of certain phonetic laws; for example:—

"Mat·vāo·padáish·yá·frasrútā·īzhayāo.

Pairijasái·Mazdá·ustānazastō.

At·váo·ashú·aredrahyāchā·nemanghā.

At·váo·vānghéush·mananghō·hunaretātā,"

becomes in Sanskrit—

"Manavah padáih yū praçrutá īháyáh

Parigachhí medha uttánahastah.

At va ṛtena radhrasyacha namásá.

At vō vasor manasah sūnṛtayá."¹

* * * * *

"The phonetic system of Zend consists of simple signs which express the different shades of sound in the language

or the Small Avesta, containing the Yasht, the contents of which are for the most part mythological, with shorter prayers for private devotion.

¹ "With verses of my making, which now are heard, and with prayerful hands, I come before thee, Mazda, and with the sincere humility of the upright man and with the believer's song of praise."

with great precision. In the vowel-system a notable feature is the presence of the short vowels *e* and *o*, which are not found in Sanskrit and Old Persian; thus the Sanskrit *santi*, Old Persian *hantiy*, becomes *henti* in Zend. The use of the vowels is complicated by a tendency to combinations of vowels and to epenthesis, i.e., the transposition of weak vowels into the next syllable; e.g., Sanskrit *bharati*, Zend *baraiti* (he carries); Old Persian *margu*, Zend *mōurvá* (Merv); Sanskrit *rinakti*, Zend *irinakhti*. Triphthongs are not uncommon; e.g., Sanskrit *açvebhyas* (dative plural of *açva*, a horse) is in Zend *aspaeibyó*; Sanskrit *kṛnoti* (he does), Zend *kere-naoiti*. Zend has also a great tendency to insert irrational vowels, especially near liquids; owing to this the words seem rather inflated; e.g., *savya* (on the left) becomes in Zend *hávaya*; *bhrájati* (it glitters), Zend *barázaiti*; *gnā* (*yvñ*), Zend *genā*. In the consonantal system we are struck by the abundance of sibilants (*s* and *sh*, in three forms of modification, *z* and *zh*) and nasals (five in number), and by the complete absence of *l*. A characteristic phonetic change is that of *rt* into *sh*; e.g., Zend *asha* for Sanskrit *rta*, Old Persian *arta* (in Aratax-erxes); *fravashi* for Pahlavi *fravardin*, New Persian *ferver* (the spirits of the dead). The verb displays a like abundance of primary forms with Sanskrit, but the conjugation by periphrasis is only slightly developed. The noun has the same eight cases as in Sanskrit. In the *Gāthās* there is a special ablative, limited, as in Sanskrit, to the "a" stems, whilst in later Zend the ablative is extended to all the stems indifferently.

"We do not know in what character Zend was written before the time of Alexander. From the Sassanian period we find an alphabetic and very legible character in use, and derived from Sassanian Pahlavi and closely resembling the later Pahlavi found in books. The oldest known manuscripts are of the 14th century A.D."]

APPENDIX.

I. GUSHTASP AND ZOROASTER.

(Translated from the German of Dr. F. von Spiegel, *Irānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. I. bk. II. chap. II. pp. 668-716.)

II. IRĀNIAN ART.

(*Ibid.* vol. III. bk. VII. chap. V. pp. 797-834.)

III. THE IRĀNIAN ALPHABETS.

(*Ibid.* vol. III. bk. VII. chap. II. pp. 759-771.)

APPENDIX.

I. GUSHTĀSP AND ZOROASTER.

WE can hardly treat of Gushtāsp¹ and his reign, without previously speaking of Zoroaster, not merely because the appearance of the Prophet is the most important event of that reign, but also because a great part of the incidents to be presently described would be unintelligible, if the acceptance of the religion of Zoroaster were not considered as a previous fact. For the first time we meet in these obscure ages with a personality of which we can ask, whether the historical character does not outweigh the mythological and legendary. Zoroaster is, further, a personage frequently named not only by Oriental, but also by Western authors. We are, therefore, obliged not to be contented regarding his career with the testimony derived from those sources, which we have before designated as the only Irānian traditions extant; but we must here add a few supplementary remarks on the authorities for our knowledge of the life of Zoroaster.

The name of Zoroaster was known to the Greeks and Romans, and is often mentioned by them as that of the founder of the Magian religion. If we approach the matter more closely, and enquire what those Greeks and Romans knew regarding him, we only find in each case notices which are not at all sufficient for a sketch of Zoroaster's life and work. Much less can we

¹ It is well known that this name takes the form Vīstāçpa in Old-Persian and Old-Bactrian, and is identical with the Greek form *Hystaspes*.

expect from the classical writers a description of those remote times wherein Zoroaster is said to have lived. There are, on the whole, only three writers of whom we can avail ourselves with regard to this question, namely, Herodotus, Berosus, and Ktesias. The two first are trustworthy authors and justly deserve to be relied upon; but Herodotus has not named Zoroaster at all, and Berosus, of whose writings we have only a few fragments, has perhaps mentioned him by name, but this cannot be affirmed with certainty. As regards Ktesias, his accounts are generally considered to be unreliable. So much may here be sufficient by way of preliminary remark concerning those writers of whom we shall speak more fully later on.

Our Oriental sources are far more complete than the Western ones, and also deserve to be described somewhat more in detail. In the Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions the name of Zoroaster is nowhere mentioned; and, even if it be probable that he was already known in the time of Darius, such a belief will have to be proved from internal evidence. So frequently does the Avesta mention the founder of the *Mazdayasnān* religion, that it is self-evident that the accounts given in this book respecting the Irānian founder of religion, have for us a peculiar significance. With these accounts are linked those notices, partly also valuable, which are given in later Parsi writings on the life of Zoroaster, and which must be at least partially based on more ancient accounts. The information afforded by Mahomedan writers, hitherto availed of, like Hamza and the author of Mujmil, is indeed not very copious, though not without some value. The same may also be said respecting the account of Shāhrastāni, who has noticed Zoroaster to some extent in his work on religious parties and philosophical schools.

Special attention, however, respecting this period must be paid to the Book of Irānian Kings, viz., the *Shahnaméh*. It must be observed that the particular section, which

describes the work of Zoroaster and a portion of the reign of Gushtāsp, does not belong to Firdūsi, but to the more ancient poet Dakiki, who had commenced to write this portion of the Book of Kings, but, owing to his violent death, was cut short in his work, before he had yet finished more than a thousand couplets. Now Firdūsi states that Dakiki appeared to him in a dream, and requested him to embody his unfinished work in the Book of Kings, with which request Firdūsi complied. This entire portion of the Book of Kings (which extends from page 1065 to 1108 of M. Macan's edition), cannot, therefore, be regarded as proceeding from Firdūsi. However, as Firdūsi does not express himself very enthusiastically regarding Dakiki in the concluding words to that part, it can hardly have been his veneration for the deceased poet, which prompted him to enlarge his work. The true reasons are not, however, difficult to penetrate. The secure position which Mahmud of Gazni had conferred upon the poet Firdūsi to enable him to finish undisturbed his great work, proved a source of envy to the courtiers. They attempted to raise suspicion against the poet in the mind of his patron, and especially maligned him by saying that his great enthusiasm for the traditional lore of the nation was due to his inclination towards the old religion of the country. The suspicion of not being an orthodox Moslem would have appeared monstrous in the eyes of so fanatical a king as Mahmud was, and for a poet made thus suspect a description of the life and acts of Zoroaster was an extremely delicate task. Firdūsi, by ostensibly taking up the work of his predecessor, which directly treated of that very life of the Irānian Prophet, evaded all difficulties. While he fully secured himself by that device, it cannot be denied that he also did his best for us.

As is well known Dakiki was never converted to Islāmism. He belonged to the old religion of the country, and had not the least reason to describe the life and the exploits of his

Prophet otherwise than they were known to him. Consequently, we can believe ourselves entitled to consider the account of Zoroaster in the Book of Kings as a true representation of the view which people had at that time in Irān of the work of the Prophet, at all events a truer one than that which Firdūsi would have been able to offer or justified in offering. The peculiar features of this description by Dakiki are the Buddhistic elements, which appear to have found a place in the Zoroastrian belief, and then again the hostile feeling against the religion of Zoroaster, which we shall treat of more fully in due course. It is as easy to explain the one as the other. We know that, in the period after Alexander, Buddhism was powerful in Eastern Irān, and that it counted its confessors as far as Taberistān. It is especially certain that many Buddhist priests were found in Bactria.¹ This state of things, which began perhaps in the first century before Christ, lasted till the seventh century A. D., when the appearance of Islāmism alone cut short the development of Buddhism in Kābul and Bactria; and it is in that period that we will have to place the rise of the Zarathushtra-legend in the form in which it is presented to us by Dakiki. It is natural enough that the adherents of the doctrine of Zoroaster did not regard with favour the astonishingly rapid progress which the Buddhist religion made in Bactria and the adjoining countries; but it is also obvious that in spite thereof they were inclined to accept several peculiarities of the new religion, when they found it convenient to do so. All these circumstances show that the Oriental legend of Zoroaster is throughout transmitted to us in its Bactrian form.

If we now consider more closely this remarkable character, who was destined to play so important a part in

¹ *Vide* the proofs in Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumskunde*, II. p. 1075.

Irānian intellectual life,¹ we shall have to say a few words first with reference to his name. Among the ancients he usually appears under the name Ζωρόαστρος, and from this form has originated the current form Zoroaster, which name we have also here retained as thus generally intelligible. Only Diodorus calls him by the name of Ζαθραόστρης,² probably on the authority of Ktesias. Among the later writers we also find the name-forms Ζάρης, Ζαράδης, and Ζαράτος; but M. Windischmann appears to me to have proved that by the latter names is meant, not Zoroaster, but an Assyrian, who is said to have been the so-called teacher of Pythagoras. The most ancient Irānian form that we know of his name is pronounced Zarathushtra, and with it the Greek Ζωρόαστρος does not quite harmonize. It must be presumed that the Western nations had a somewhat different form of the name, which may perhaps have sounded Zarausta, and from this we may trace its Greek version. All the Oriental forms of the name go back to the original Zarathushtra, by which the Armenian Zardasht may be accounted for. In Huzvaresh the forms are Zertusht and Zartuhsh; in Modern Persian the most usual are Zardusht and Zarduhasht. Other less common variations have been collected by M. Windischmann.³

It has been found not less difficult to arrive at the precise meaning of the name than it has been to fix its original form. The explanation transmitted to us by the ancients, which, it is presumed, proceeds from Deinon, and according to which the word signifies the same as

¹ For the following, compare Windischmann, *Zoroastr. Studien*, p. 44.

² According to Lagard (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 47), it might be read Xaothraustes in Diodorus.

³ Zārtusht, Zarāduhasht, Zārtuhash, Zārhush, Zarātusht, Zarādusht, Zartusht, Zārdusht, Zārduhash, Zarahtusht, Zaradusht, even Zārdish, Zardisht, (*Zor. Studien*, p. 45).

ἀστροδάτης, which Bochart supposed to be *ἀστροθεάτης*, has long been rejected as untenable. With regard to the explanation of the native form *Zarathushtra*, to which all attempts at interpretation are now entirely confined, no one has hitherto come to any conclusion, not even concerning the language according to which the name should be explained. Mr. George Rawlinson, however, has very recently attempted to explain it by means of the Semitic languages; assuming *Ziru Ishtar* as the original form, *Ziru* might be the Semitic זִרּוּ, 'seed, descendant,' *Ishtar* the name of the planet Venus. Of course the explanation is nearer and more probable if one endeavours to interpret it through the Irānian languages, but, even with the aid of interpretations based on them, one cannot lay claim to absolute certainty. The explanation of Dr. F. Müller appears to me to be the most probable, according to which *Zarathushtra* would mean "possessing courageous camels."¹ The word should, on this suppo-

¹ [F. Müller, *Zendstudien*, part I., Vienna, 1863, pp. 3-7:—
"The name of the great prophet of the Irānians, whom we commonly call Zoroaster, according to the Greek form *Ζωροάδτρης*, is pronounced *Zarathushtra* in the language in which he himself spoke. Its true etymological meaning is a matter of conjecture only.

"The modern adherents of the Prophet interpret the name, according to the modern Persian form *Zardusht* or *Zartusht*, (زرتشت — زردشت) as meaning 'a gold star'. Should this explanation be traced to Old-Bactrian, in which *zairi* corresponds to the first part *zar*, 'gold,' while the name of the star Tishtar (تیشتار) must stand for the second part *tusht*, *dusht*, 'a star,' we must substitute for *Zartusht*, a different form, *zairitishtrya*, which bears but little resemblance to the real form of the name *Zarathushtra*.

"An etymology based on the form *Zarathushtra* itself, is given by Burnouf, the founder of Zend studies, (*Comm. sur le Yacna XII.*), who analyzes the word into *zarath* and *ushtra*, and explains it by 'fulvos camelos habens.' Of these component parts

sition, be altered to *Zaratushtra*—the change of a *t* into *th* is likewise witnessed in the Gāthās in some other examples, especially in such words in which *u* follows *t*. Besides, other names also prove that the Irānians made use of the word *ushtra*, “camel,” in the formation of proper names (for instance *Frashastra*). As already said, even this interpretation is not perfectly reliable.

As regards the age in which Zoroaster probably flourished, we shall hardly be able to arrive at more certainty than in the case of his name and its meaning.

the second can now be shown to have the meaning ‘camel’ in the stock of the Old-Bactrian language, and can also be compared with the second part *aspa*, ‘horse’ in analogous proper names, such as *Vishtāspa*, *Keresāspa*, *Pourushaspa*, *Haechataspa*. However, as regards the first part *zarath*, Haug justly remarks that it cannot bear the meaning ‘yellow’ (for, as is well known, ‘yellow’ is denoted in Old-Bactrian by *zairita*, and in modern Persian by *zard*); but it must be the form of a present participle, (Old-Bactrian *zarat* = Skr. *harat*, *jarat*). Thus the meaning suggested by Burnouf is likewise inadmissible, on account of the objections to the first part of the compound name he suggests.

“Another meaning, which, if I mistake not, is suggested by Roth, is that of *Zarathushtra* as ‘a goldsmith.’ But a two-fold objection, phonetic as well as practical, might be urged against it. If we adopt this meaning, we must divide the word into *zara* and *thushtra*, and explain *zara* to be ‘gold.’ However, this form cannot be proved to exist in Old-Bactrian, where the word for ‘gold’ is invariably pronounced *zairi* = Skr. *hari*. Again, the second part, *thushtra*, presupposes a violent contraction as well as a lengthening of the suffix, of the word *θworeštarō* (*thworeshtare*); both these forms, moreover, have nothing analogous to them in Old-Bactrian. Now, as regards the practical objections, I believe, they are still weightier. As is well known the Avesta everywhere speaks only of three orders: priests (*zoroastri*), warriors (*varus*), and husbandmen (*baras*); but we do not find any mention of handicraftsmen in the oldest fragments, still less of artists who devoted themselves to the man-

To what period Zoroaster belongs, according to the view of Oriental authorities, is already known from our previous inquiries concerning the chronology of the legendary history regarding him. According to these authorities, Zoroaster belongs to the middle portion of the duration of the world since the creation of the human race, or 9,000 years after the creation of the world. We also know that, according to Irānian dogmatics, a thousand years

facture of such an article of luxury as gold [?]. Now if we suppose Zarathushtra to have received this name either on account of his own vocation or of that of his father, we shall have to make an assumption which is inconsistent with the sacred writings and external evidences, and which could only be based upon the etymology above proposed. We must, therefore, also reject this etymology, which identifies Zarathushtra as a goldsmith.

"A derivation founded on the analysis of the word into *zarath* and *ushtra* is proposed by Haug in his *Gāthās*, vol. II. p. 246. The first part admits of three significations: (1) 'growing old,' (Skr. *jarat*), which is rejected as being evidently inappropriate; (2) 'heart,' (Skr. *hṛd*); (3) 'praise-singing,' (Skr. *garat*). The second part *ushtra*, however, is not rendered by 'camel,' but explained to be a contraction of *uttara*, 'excellent.' Zarathushtra, therefore, is either 'he who has an excellent heart,' or what seems better—'the excellent panegyric poet or singer,' according as we determine upon the one or the other meaning of the word *zarath*.

"Both these etymologies also present phonetic as well as practical difficulties. If we regard the former, the identification of *zarath* with *zarad*, and also of the latter with *z̄r̄d̄hām* (*zeredhaēm*), is striking; for its identity with Skr. *hṛd* is disputed in the passages cited by Haug (*Yasna XLIII. 11; XXXI. 1; sās · mashyaēshu · zarazdāitish; — yoi · zarazdāo · aghen · Mazdāi*), wherein *zaraz* occurs as the first part of a composite word. We might suggest *haras* with the same, if not with greater justice (Benfey, *Glossar zum Samaveda*, p. 206). Again the identity of *th* with *d* still remains doubtful, even if we concede that *zaraz* and *hṛd* are identical.

"In just the same way it is difficult to identify *ushtra* with *uttara*; because, even if we allow the elimination of *a*, for which, indeed, there is no authority,—since this change is never witnessed in the suffix *tara*,—we should also expect the form *uṣṭra*, just

- cannot yet have fully elapsed since his death, for otherwise a new prophet should have already appeared.¹ That we cannot with such *data* undertake to describe chronologically the life of Zoroaster, needs no further proof. Let us see whether the accounts of our Western writers help us to any better result.

The age of Zoroaster has been of late the object of searching inquiries.² The oldest Western writer, who

¹ Some Christian writers, like Abul Faraj (Histdynast. ed. Pococke, p. 33), and Eutychius (Annal ed. Selden, p. 262), affirm that Zoroaster lived under Smerdes and Cambyses. This opinion seems to originate from the Mahomadans, in which case perhaps 1,000 years might have elapsed before the appearance of Muhammad, perhaps the prophet whom the Irānians had expected at that period.

² Windischmann, *Zor. Studien*, pp. 270, 274, 279, 285, 291, 302; Rapp, *Zeitschrift der DMG*. vol. XIX. p. 22.

as *basta* = *bad* + *ta*, and *dasta* = *dath* + *ta*. It happens, however, that the form *zarathushtra*, as against the faulty *zarathustra*, is on the one hand attested as the correct one; while, on the other, it is only the former, and not the latter, that can be the result of new forms with *sh* or *t*.

“ Besides these phonetic difficulties, there is also a practical one with reference to the name. When Haug interprets the name as ‘an excellent praise-singer,’ and therewith observes that the chanting of hymns in the Gāthās plays an important part, and that Zarathushtra appears himself as a poet, he of course speaks of the Prophet and of the religious founder. It must then be assumed that Zarathushtra was not the *real* name, but only *a title of honour* given to the founder of the Parsi religion; but this assumption is not confirmed by the sacred writings. If the name is not a mere title of honour but a real name which belonged to the Prophet from his childhood, such a supposition cannot be supported by any analogy; for, if we examine the old Persian proper names occurring in the Avesta and elsewhere, we do not find among them any which could have been formed in a similar way, especially taking into consideration Zarathushtra’s high spiritual excellence.

“ The interpretation of the name Zarathushtra as ‘the most excellent panegyric poet,’ was later on abandoned by Haug

mentions Zoroaster, is Xanthus of Sardis, who is said to have placed Zoroaster 600 years (according to others 6,000 years) before the fall of Xerxes. Should the first of these statements be correct, Zoroaster must have flourished about 1080 years before Christ. As Pliny (*H. N.* XXX.

himself, (*Essays*, 1st ed. 1862, p. 252, Note), who adopted another instead. According to this view the name may be supposed to mean 'the most excellent director or guardian.' In this case we have the first part *zarath* = Skr. *jarat* 'old,' whilst the second part bears the same meaning as above. Against this explanation the same difficulties may be urged as before; and we should certainly again set forth the same objections, were it not that Haug regards the name Zarathushtra as, indeed, only an appellation, perhaps denoting 'a high-priest.' But, according to this assumption, the proper name of the founder of the Parsi religion would then be quite unknown, which is plainly inconsistent with the testimony of the sacred writings and the oldest tradition of the Parsis on the one hand, and the history of different religions on the other. Again, the existence of several Zarathushtras will have to be proved, a point which could neither be supported by the scriptures nor by the legends.

"My opinion is that in order to give a correct interpretation of the name, we must first analyze it into its elementary parts, and then try to justify our explanation by proper analogies. If we now examine the name, which is no doubt a compound word, we must unquestionably divide it into *zarath* and *ushtra*. The latter word can in this case, as elsewhere, only denote a 'camel,' while the form *zarath*, as Haug has already correctly observed, cannot but be a present participle.

"Thus the question is only one regarding the correct meaning. The simplest way would be to trace *zarath* to the Old Indian root *har* 'to take, to gain anything as booty,' and the word would then mean, just as *bharad-vāja* and *jamad-agni*, 'obtaining camels as booty' (cf. *वृश्चिकः* 'having horses won or conquered').

But I prefer to take *zarath* as a present participle from the root *har* = *ghar*, from which also comes the word *haras*, 'glowing fire,' then 'wrath' (*haras krodhanāma*). Accordingly, *Zarathushtra* must mean 'possessing courageous camels,' (compare *घृष्णुम्* 'having lean horses,' *घृष्णुम्, लूप* 'having shaggy

1, 2) informs us, Eudoxus and Aristotle place Zoroaster 6,000 years before the death of Plato (*i. e.*, 6350 B. C.), while Hermodorus, who was a disciple of Plato, following Eudoxus and Aristotle, fixes upon 5,000 years before the Trojan war (*i. e.*, 6100 B. C.). With the latter statement Plutarch also agrees (the "*Isid.*" ch. 48), as well as Hermippus, according to the testimony of Pliny. Whether Berossus has named this Zoroaster must remain doubtful, and even if the name Zoroaster really occurred in his writings, he may not have meant thereby the founder of the Irānian religion, but, as I believe, a king of the same name. M. Windischmann has already fully discussed¹ the statement of Porphyrius, that Zoroaster was probably the teacher of Pythagoras, and might be placed, therefore, in the sixth century before the Christian era. The same writer has also proved that *Záßparos* named by Porphyrius cannot be our Zoroaster. Agathias tells us that Zoroaster lived under a king Hystaspes, but it is not clear whether the latter was the father of Darius or not. Naturally, Agathias here means Vishtāspa or Gushtāsp; he may even have had before him the same legend respecting Zoroaster which we read at the present day. Suidas even distinguishes between two different Zoroasters, one of whom is said to have lived 500 years (5,000 years may be read) before the Trojan war; the other is said to

¹ Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, p. 261.

horses'). This simple explanation is also intelligibly supported by the constant occurrence in Greek as well as in Persian of such names as contain *εἶπον* 'horse' in the second part. That the camel was a domestic animal like the horse, among the ancient Persians, appears most clearly from Vend. XV. 68 seq.; it was even regarded as a more costly animal than the horse. (Comp. Vend. XIV. 50-53).

"Now as regards the epithet 'courageous' applied to camels, I refer my readers to the excellent description of them in Tarafah Muallaqah, verses 11 seq." *Tr. n.*]

have been an astronomer, who lived in the age of Ninus. On these statements of Suidas very little reliance can be placed. One here sees clearly that he found in his sources of information different statements respecting Zoroaster, which he was unable to reconcile with one another, and which he endeavoured to bring into harmony by distinguishing in this manner between two persons of the same name. How one should act on these contradictory testimonies, it is not difficult to indicate. Dr. Rapp¹ has justly remarked that the accounts which place the age of Zoroaster about 6,000 years back, are of little importance, since it is incredible that at that time chronicles could have been available, which safely followed up the history of the past five or six thousand years. These statements can thus prove no more than that even at the time when they were made, Zoroaster was not known to be a historical personage. As regards the statements of Xanthus, their accuracy has been questioned, and though the reasons, which caused this doubt are not solid,² so much is indeed certain, that his chronology is not reliable. As Xanthus places Zoroaster 6,000 years before the expedition of Xerxes, we need not waste time on his statement; but more than this, even when he places him only 600 years before this period, it is still more than doubtful whether his historical proofs extended even so far back. There remains only Ktesias, according to whose statement Zoroaster seems to fall into the same period with Ninus. But, leaving aside the fact that the testimony of Ktesias is generally not much to be relied upon, we must also doubt whether he really meant the Irānian founder of religion by the Bactrian king Zoroaster, of whom he may have spoken, or only a king of that name. After a review of the different statements recorded in Western writings, it will not surprise any one, if we give it as our opinion that neither Occidental nor Oriental

¹ Rapp, *ZddmG.* vol. XIX. p. 25.

² Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 268-275.

testimony yields us any sure ground on which to fix the age of Zoroaster. In this view MM. Gutschmid¹ and Rapp² have already preceded us.

Still more material than the question regarding the name and the period of Zoroaster, is that concerning his native country, on account of the important conclusions which can be drawn from the answer to the latter. However, it will scarcely be ever possible to arrive at quite a certain result on this point. We begin our review of the several notices which lie before us of the native land of Zoroaster, with the Westerns and especially with Ktesias, not only because he is one of the most ancient historians, but also because he has a certain importance from the fact that a number of other writers have followed him. According to the historical account of Ktesias, which Diodorus has preserved for us, Ninus is said to have, with 1,700,000 foot and 210,000 horse, invaded Bactria, where the king of the land, Oxyartes, awaited him with 400,000 men. Victorious in the beginning, the Bactrian king had in the end to give way to superior power, and was obliged to retire to his capital, where he was then defeated by Ninus with the assistance of Semiramis. In the account of Diodorus there does not at all occur, as we find, the name of Zoroaster. It is true, the name of the Bactrian king does not everywhere appear as Oxyartes; several manuscripts also give instead Εξαόρτης, other Χαόρτης and Ζαόρτης, but in none do we meet with Ζωροάστρης. Nor is it less probable that the name may have been thus pronounced originally. We still possess fragments of a historiographer, Kephalion,³ who has

¹ *Beiträge Zur Geschichte des alten Orients*, p. 90.

² Rapp, *ZdmG*. vol. XIX. p. 26.

³ Kephalion in Eusebius *Chron. arm I*, 43 ed. Aucher:—
“Incipio scribere de quibus et alii commemorarunt atque in primis Ellanicus Lesbius Ctesiasque Cnidius, deinde Herodotus Alicarnassus. Primum Asiae imperarunt Assyrii, ex quibus erat Ninus Beli (filius), cuius regni aetate res quam plurimae celeberrima eque

confessedly made use of Ktesias concerning the same story, and he expressly gives the name of king Zoroaster, in a tradition at least, to him who is called by Diodorus, Oxyartes. With him Eusebius¹ and Theo² agree. After them Arnobius³ and finally the Berosian Sibyl,

virtutes gestae fuerunt. Postea his adjiciens profert etiam generationes Semiramidis atque (narrat) de Zoroastri Magi Bactrianorum regis debellatione a Semiramide; nec non tempus Nini LII. annos fuisse, atque de obitu ejus. Post quem quum regnasset Semiramis, muro Babylonem circumdedit ad eandem formam, qua a plerisque dictum est: Ctesia nimirum et Zenone Herodotoque nec non aliis ipsorum posteris. Deinde etiam apparatus belli Semiramidis adversus Indos ejusdemque cladem et fugam narrat, &c." "I proceed to write of matters which others also have treated, especially Ellanicus the Lesbian and Ctesias the Cnidian, and also Herodotus of Halicarnassus. The Assyrians first ruled Asia. Among them was Ninus, son of Belus, during the time of whose reign the most numerous exploits were achieved and the most glorious virtues displayed. Next after these he mentions also the generations of Semiramis, and describes the rebellion against Semiramis of Zoroaster, the Magus king of the Bactrians. He says that the term of Ninus's reign was fifty-two years and speaks of his death. Semiramis reigned after him, and surrounded Babylon with a wall exactly as described by most authors, by Ctesias in particular, by Zeno and Herodotus and others after them. He moreover describes the preparations of Semiramis for the war against the Indians, her defeat and flight, &c." This event is also recorded by Syncellus in quite a similar manner.

¹ Eusebius, *Chron. IV.* 35 ed. Aucher:—"Zoroastres Magus rex Bactrianorum clarus habetur adversus quem Ninus dimicavit." "Zoroaster the Magus, king of the Bactrians, against whom Ninus fought, is considered famous." *Praep. Ev. X. 9.* "Over whom (the Bactrians) Zoroaster reigned."

² Progymnast:—"Zoroaster was the king of the Bactrians . . ." Cf. Arnob. *adv. gent. I. 5.* :—"Ut inter Assyrios et Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroastreque ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicatur et viribus, verum etiam magicis et Chaldaeorum ex recondito disciplinis, invidia nostra haec fuit?" "Has this feud of ours

whom we shall mention hereafter, also place Zoroaster in Bactria.

As all the reports just enumerated associate Ninus with a king Zoroaster, it appears, indeed, as though the name of Oxyartes had been erroneously substituted for that of Zoroaster in the text of Diodorus. That even Ktesias could have meant by the Zoroaster named by him the founder of the Irānian religion, can by no means be confidently asserted, as the entire narrative has evidently undergone transformation in a later age. This becomes extremely clear when we compare the text of Diodorus with that of Arnobius; they both refer to the same facts; but whilst, according to the story of the first, two kings fight against each other with overwhelming forces, according to the second, Ninus appears as the representative of the Chaldean, Zoroaster as that of the Bactrian Magi. Since, however, in the account of Diodorus there is no allusion to Zoroaster's religious character, in spite of its being really the most complete report, it appears to me very probable that the mention made by Ktesias was only with reference to a king Zoroaster, and that the same was changed later on into the Magus. Besides, there is to a certain degree an inconsistency in calling anybody a Magus and at the same time a Bactrian. Hence I am inclined to doubt whether we can quote Ktesias as an authority for the opinion that Zoroaster had his home in Bactria. We must, however, admit that we are in no case inclined to rely much on the assertions of this historian.

Besides those already cited, there still remain some ancient authorities who regard Zoroaster as a Bactrian, without allowing one to affirm that they, too, have borrowed their statements from Ktesias. But such authorities belong to a late period. One of these is Agathias

been like the war between the Assyrians and the Bactrians under Zoroaster and Ninus, in which strength and arms were not only used but also incantation and the mystic arts of the Chaldeans?"

(L. II., 24 ed. Nieb.), another Ammianus Marcellinus (XXIII. 6. 32). Both these writers recognize in Zoroaster not a king but the founder of a religion; both place him under a king Hystaspes. The former observes that we cannot tell whether this Hystaspes was the father of Darius or not, the latter on the contrary explicitly calls him the father of Darius. It appears to me very probable, not to say certain, that both these authors had the knowledge which we still possess at the present day as to the life of Zoroaster, namely, the fact that he flourished under a king *Vishtāspa* or *Gushtāsp*. If Ammianus recognized in this *Vishtāspa*, Hystaspes the father of Darius, who was alone known to him, we think such recognition very natural, but just as incorrect as his representing Zoroaster as a Bactrian, because he heard that the latter had worked in Bactria.

Besides, it is not at all the general view of antiquity that Zoroaster was a Bactrian; a whole series of authorities look upon him as a Mede or a Persian. In support of the view that Zoroaster was a Mede the authority of Berossus may perhaps be cited. This writer has composed a work, which is mentioned by the ancients under the title of Χαλδαικά or Βαβυλωνιακά. In estimating the value of this work of Berossus ancient authors are full of praise, in which modern writers also participate. An unfortunate fate has followed the book, not only in that it is lost, but also in the fact that the few fragments preserved are not transmitted to us in their original form, but have passed through several hands before reaching us. With justice does the latest publisher,¹ therefore, observe:—

“*Fragmenta satis ampla prae ceteris servarunt Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Syncellus. Quorum*

¹ Vd. C. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* II. p. 496.

tamen ne unus quidem ipsos Berosi libros inspexisse videtur (comp. M. von Niebuhr, *Geschichte Assurs*, p. 12). Syncellus ex Eusebio, vel secuti Eusebius sua hausit ex Africano; Africanus ex Alexandro Polyhistore, hic ex Apollodoro ut videtur. Eodem Polyhistore usus fuerit Josephus, etsi mentionem fontis injicere omisit. Clemens Alexandrinus ob oculos habuit Jubam Mauritanum qui Berosi librum in Assyriis historiis excerptissse videtur. Igitur quum per tot manus migraverint quae ad nos perdurarunt fragmenta, haud miraberis variis modis verba Berosi deformata esse, cavendumque ne Beroso imputemus quae sunt imputanda excerptoribus."

" Fairly large fragments have been preserved, especially by Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Syncellus. But not one of them seems to have examined Berossus' original works. Syncellus has borrowed from Eusebius, or like Eusebius from Africanus, Africanus from Alexander Polyhistor, and he apparently from Appolodorus. Josephus must have made use of the same Polyhistor, although he has omitted to mention his authority. Clemens Alexandrinus had before him Juba, the Mauritanian, who seems to have quoted from the book of Berossus in his Assyrian histories. As, therefore, the fragments which survive have passed through so many hands, it is not to be wondered at that the words of Berossus have been mutilated in various ways, and care must be taken not to ascribe to Berossus what should be imputed to those who quote him."¹

It also appears that from this particular Berossus a Sibylla Berosiana, who ranks far lower than the former, is to be distinguished. Upon this our authority speaks as follows :—

" *Dubium vix est, quin alium quandam Berosum Sibyllae patrem cum historico Justinus (cf. Justinus Martyr Cohort. c. 39) confuderit. Quem errorem facile excusa-*

¹ C. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* II. p. 495.

veris, si verum est, quod sane verisimillimum est, ipsum Berosum Sibyllae istius Berosiana in historiis suis meminisse. Nam quae ex Sibylla narrat Alexander Polyhistor de turris Babylonicae aedificio vix aliunde quam ex Nostri libris petita fuerint."

"There is scarcely any doubt that Justin has confounded with the historian some other Berosus, the father of Sibylla. This error can easily be excused, if it be true, as seems indeed most probable, that Berosus himself has in his history made mention of that Sibylla, daughter of Berosus. What Alexander Polyhistor borrows from Sibylla, concerning the building of the Tower of Babylon, could scarcely have been collected from other sources than the books of our Berosus."¹

Much more severely does M. von Niebuhr express himself:—"The extract concerning the Sibyl of the Tower ought to be strictly separated from those taken from Berosus, since it is not cited as a Berosian one. Nor should we allow ourselves to be deceived when Moses Chorenensis says, whilst quoting a similar passage, that the same is to be found in the Berosian Sibyl. Besides the confused legends, which connect Berosus with a Sibyl, there is no indication that the so-called Chaldean had any other than a Jewish origin."²

Now amongst the fragments which originate from the genuine Berosus, there is one in particular that must attract our attention. It is preserved for us in a two-fold, but somewhat contradictory, form, first in the Armenian translation of Eusebius, and again in Syncellus. I quote here the passage in question as given in Petermann's translation:²—

"From Xisuthros and from the Deluge and until the Mareans (Medians) took Babylonia, *Polyhistor*

¹ M. von Niebuhr, *Geschichte Assurs*, p. 470.

² *Ibid.* pp. 491-494.

counts on the whole 86 kings, and makes mention of every one by name from the works of Berosus, and the years of all these kings he comprises in a period of 33,091 years. After these kings, according to those writers, the Medians, as they were so powerful, collected an army against Babylon, in order to capture it, and to set up as rulers tyrants of their own. Then he determines also the names of the Median tyrants numbering 8 and their years 224, and again 11 kings and years 4, then also the tyrants of the Chaldeans, 49 kings and 458 years.”¹

The author mentioned by Syncellus differs from this on several essential points. While there are 49 Chaldean kings according to Eusebius, Syncellus only mentions two of them and names 84 Median kings, then Zoroaster and 7 Chaldean kings. Hence M. C. Müller says:—

“*Qui apud Eusebium ponuntur octo tyranni Medi, numero respondent Zoroastro ejusque successoribus septem.*”

“The eight tyrants found in Eusebius answer in number to Zoroaster and his seven successors.”

The number of years, however, does not correspond. Syncellus assigns to his Medians only 190 years, while Eusebius gives 224 to his eight Median kings. On this point M. von Niebuhr remarks as follows²:—“As regards the statement of Syncellus, that Polyhistor has called only the two first kings Chaldean and the remaining 84 Medians, the version of Eusebius is clearly the genuine one. Syncellus has evidently not transcribed from Eusebius, but from another chronographer, probably Africanus. The author may, like Syncellus, have passed over the second dynasty—Syncellus in that passage mentions

¹ The italicized words are not those of Berosus, but of Eusebius. They are given in Klammer as additions of the translator.

² Cf. Müller, *Hist. Graec. Fr.* II. p. 503.

the first dynasty as being followed by Zoroaster and a Chaldean dynasty—and may have brought the Medians into the first dynasty in the place of the 84 kings whose names Eusebius has not given. However, this author, mentioned by Syncellus, may also have been honest, (which we would so much the more willingly believe, as he could scarcely have been anybody else than Africanus), and the Medians may have originated merely in "a misunderstanding." Further on M. von Niebuhr says regarding the reciprocal relation of the two accounts¹ :—"Evidently he (Syncellus) also admits in the place of the second Median dynasty of Berosus his 84 Median kings of the first dynasty, and Zoroaster and his second dynasty of 7 Chaldean kings with 190 years' interval, in the abovementioned passage, in the place of the third and fourth dynasties of Berosus." This view appears to me, likewise, the most probable; yet there is no doubt, that we can also understand this matter, as M. C. Müller, in the passage quoted above, and after him Dr. Rapp² have done, *viz.*, that Zoroaster and the 7 Chaldean kings stand in the place of the 8 Medians of Eusebius. As we have nothing to do with Babylonian history, this question has little importance for us. What principally interests us is the name Zoroaster; no matter whether Berosus meant by it a Median or a Babylonian king. It is proved at all events that the name Zoroaster already occurred at a very early period, and certainly in Media itself or westward of Media.

But the question now arises, whether we have a right to affirm that Berosus has mentioned the name Zoroaster. M. von Niebuhr believes, that Berosus has not done so, but I see no ground at all for this assumption. On the contrary, it appears to me quite possible that Africanus

¹ *Vide* Müller, *Hist. Graec. Fr.* II. p. 493.

² Rapp, *ZddmG.* vol. XIX. p. 28.

(or whoever else may have been the chronographer consulted by Syncellus) found the name Zoroaster in his evidently very hasty review of the notices of Berossus, introducing the same in his report, since Eusebius explicitly remarks, that Berossus has given the names of the Median kings. This is my principal ground for regarding the Zoroaster mentioned here as a Median, because it is nowhere stated that Berossus has also given the names of the Chaldean kings. On the contrary, this Median king, likewise the founder of the Irānian religion, named by Berossus, need not necessarily have been any other than the Bactrian king of the same name mentioned by Ktesias. In opposition to Berossus, the Berossian Sibyl, referred to by Moses of Khorni, actually places Zoroaster in Bactria, but it has been already remarked, that very little importance should be attached to that authority.

The remaining accounts by Western writers of the native country of Zoroaster may be briefly mentioned. The Greek writer Clemens Alexandrinus calls Zoroaster sometimes a Persian and sometimes a Mede, whilst Suidas calls him a Perso-Median. The Armenian Moses of Khorni, who has chiefly consulted Greek writers in his historical works, makes him a contemporary of Semiramis, and calls him "the Magus and sovereign of the Medes."¹ According to his statement, Semiramis is said to have appointed him a satrap (governor) over Nineveh and Assyria; later on they became enemies and Semiramis was obliged to flee from him to Armenia, where she was plundered and killed by one Ninyas of the Empire. Yet, in another passage, Moses corrects the Berossian Sibyl and observes that Zoroaster was not a king of Bactria, but of Media. According to the statements of Pliny the Elder, who must have obtained his materials from Hermippus, we should

¹ Mos. Khor. I. p. 87.

search for Zoroaster's native country still further West, that is, in Prokonesos. An account, which is handed down to us by Clemens Alexandrinus, mentions Zoroaster as having been born in Pamphylia, and says that he was identical with Her, the son of Arminius.

This much will be clear from these statements, *viz.*, that even with the help of the ancients we cannot arrive at a certain knowledge of the native land of Zoroaster. If we now turn to the accounts furnished by Oriental writers, we indeed find in them greater harmony, but scarcely any historical facts. They unanimously place the native land of Zoroaster in Western Irān; but most of them state that he had worked at least for some time in Bactria. From the searching inquiries which M. Windischmann has devoted to this subject,¹ it follows that Zoroaster is often called in the Avesta "the renowned in *Aryana-vaija*"; according to another idea, it is even said that he was in the celebrated Aryana-vaija. The dwelling of Pourushaspa, the father of Zoroaster, was situated, according to Vendidād, XIX. 15, near "*drejya paiti zbarahē*" (*zbarahi*), and we shall hereafter find that it cannot be at all doubted that this designation also may denote *Aryana-vaija*; for, according to Yt. V. 104, IX. 25, XVII. 45, the Prophet there offers sacrifices to several *yazatas*. In the passage Ys. XIX. 51, 52, Zoroaster is mentioned in connection with the town of *Ragha* (in Media); however, it should not be hence inferred that he was also born there.

The Bundehesh expresses itself more unequivocally than the Avesta. It asserts that Zoroaster was born near the river *Darja* (51, 3; 79, 9) and this river is situated (53, 5) in Aryana-vaija. In a passage further on (58, 5) this river is the largest of the Bāra rivers; I conjecture that by Bāra may be here understood

¹ Windischmann, *Zor. Studien*, p. 47.

the same as by *zbāra* in the Vendidād. Further on, again, the Bundehesh (70, 8) informs us that Aryana-vaija lies southward of Ātropātene, and may thus well be the territory which the medieval geographers call Arran, and which extends as far as the country of Tiflis. Taking this position into consideration, the Huzvaresh Commentary to Vd. I. 60 evidently explains Ragha by Ātropātene, but admits that others understand under that name Rai, where Zoroaster probably dwelt for some time. Yaqut, like Abulfeda, points to the town of *Urumia* as the birth-place of Zoroaster. Two less-known Mahomedan historians, who are quoted by Hyde (*Hist. Vet. Pers.* p. 318, ed. 2nd), adduce the so-called authority of Tabari to prove that Zoroaster was born in the land of the Philistines. One calls him a disciple of Esra, the other of Jeremiah. . . . If we now collect the results of all these conflicting statements, we can arrive at no certainty as regards the native land of Zoroaster; the majority of writers endeavour, however, to place it altogether in the West, and not in the East.

After disposing of these preliminary questions, we now turn to the history of the life of Zoroaster himself. Nobody will be surprised to find that the narrative of the life of a man, whose age and native land cannot be ascertained, is very legendary. For most of the legends even a foundation is wanting; most of them are to be traced to modern sources, and some of them even to very late writers. Neither the Avesta, nor antiquity, nor the Sassanian period, nor lastly Firdūsi, has bequeathed to us a complete description of Zoroaster's career, and we are hence obliged to rely upon the more modern legends, and to point for greater confirmation to the isolated passages which have been preserved to us here and there in more ancient writings; e.g. in the Avesta.¹ The entirely

¹ The principal authority for the circumstances of the life of Zoroaster is the *Zartusht-nāme*, the text of which was published

legendary character of the narrative of Zoroaster's life may be perceived from the mere fact, that his biography does not begin with his birth, but actually long before it, not only in the later legends but also in the Avesta itself. And it is true that this part of his life is not without importance. For the confessor of the *Mazdayasnān* religion the birth and the works of Zoroaster are unquestionably the most important historical events. All the great exploits of the heroes of yore, of whom we have hitherto heard, have taken place mostly for this purpose, *viz.*, to help to diminish to such an extent the sum total of evil, as to allow the good event following to take place. So early as after the death of the Primitive Bull, to the *Geush-urva* or *Goshurun*, that is, the "Soul of the Bull," (*vide Eran Alterthums-kunde*, vol. I. p. 510) is shown Zoroaster, and the hope is held out to it that the Prophet will appear in future on the earth. For it was not possible to make Zoroaster proclaim the Law at any time on earth. Only after the marks of the equipoise had come to rule, and the forces of the good and the evil principles were balanced, could it be ordained to send Zoroaster into this world. How important Zoroaster was to Ahura Mazda and His plans is also perceived from Yt. V. 17.

in lithograph at Bombay. I use the English translation of that book by Eastwick, which is found printed in the book of Dr. J. Wilson, "*The Parsi Religion Unfolded*," p. 477. A *Vie de Zoroastre* (Life of Zoroaster) is given by Anquetil (*Zend Avest.* I. 2, pp. 1-70), another by J. Ménant: *Zoroastre, Essai sur la philosophie religieuse de la Perse* ("Essay on the Religious Philosophy of the Persians") 2nd edition, Paris, 1857; both of these works are based on the above-named legend of Zoroaster. An unfinished sketch of the life of Zoroaster is given by Windischmann (*Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 44-56) and myself (*Sitzungsberichte der K. bayr. Academie der Wissensch.* Jan. 1867). A life of Zoroaster by Dastur Z. Behram (Bombay 1864), in Gujerati, is a translation of the *Zarthusht-nāme* with some annotations [by Dastur Peshotāñji Behramji Sanjānā.]

The family from which a personage like Zoroaster springs is of no less importance than the circumstances of his birth. As we shall shortly observe, Zoroaster is of kingly descent, and has, therefore, every right to be celebrated in the Irānian hero-legends, for, from his birth, he stands second to none of the early heroes of royal lineage; and a hero too he is, though of a different kind from his predecessors, but not, therefore, of lesser importance, since his agency is spiritual. To these heroic attributes we have to ascribe the fact that, according to Yt. XVII. 17-20,¹ *Angrō Manyu* runs away at his birth, and acknowledges that none of the *yazatas* have the power to supplant him, save Zoroaster alone, who smites him with the *Ahuna-vairya* as his weapon. Hence his father *Pourushaspa*, according to Ys. IX. 42, is named together with such great heroes as *Yima*, *Āthwya* and *Kereshāspa*, for the heroes already named and others have only taken the lives of some of the evil

¹ Ashi Vanguhi spoke thus:—“Who art thou who dost invoke me, whose voice is to my ear the sweetest of all that invoke me most?”

“And Zarthushtra said aloud! ‘I am Spitama Zarathustra, who, first of mortals, recited the praise of the excellent Asha and offered up sacrifice unto Ahura Mazda and the Amesha-Spentas; in whose birth and growth the waters and the plants rejoiced; in whose birth and growth the waters and the plants grew; in whose birth and growth all the creatures of the good creation cried out, Hail!’

‘In whose birth and growth Angra Mainyu rushed away from this wide, round earth, whose ends lie afar, and he, the evil-doing Angra Mainyu, who is all death, said:—All the gods together have not been able to smite me down in spite of myself, and Zarathushtra alone can reach me in spite of myself. He smites me with the Ahuna Vairyā, as strong a weapon as a stone big as a house; he burns me with Asha-Vahishta, as if it were melting brass. He makes it better for me that I should leave this earth, he, Spitama Zarathustra, the only one who can daunt me.’” *Vide Darmesteter.*

monsters. But Zoroaster has, by the promulgation of the Law, brought it to pass, that all those demons, who, at an earlier period, had been roving bodily about this world, had to hide themselves together under the earth. The Huzvāresh Commentary says in Ys. IX. 46:—

“He broke the body of everyone who could make his body invisible; whoever could not do this, broke it himself. —The breaking of the body implies the fact that no more sin can be henceforward committed in the body of a demon, though in the body of a beast or of a man such beings are still able to commit sin”

After this it may be said that Zoroaster marks the close of the mythical age. For, since he came into this world, the appearance of demons with supernatural bodies and powers is no more possible; thus, therefore, ends the necessity for the heavenly powers to develop such special strength; the world may follow its regular course. These remarks sufficiently show what an important personage Zoroaster is, and that the race may be deemed highly respectable which is entitled to count him amongst its members. We also know that his father Pourushaspa was allowed to enjoy the honour of being called the father of Zoroaster for this special reason that he belonged to the most zealous adorers of *Haoma*. Besides this, the *Zartusht-nāme* traces the descent of Zoroaster from Faridūn. We know, however, that from this king not only Eraj, but also Selam and Tūr together with their descendants derived their origin, so that this lineage is in itself not specially significant. Of greater importance is the fact that Zoroaster's descent is not merely traced from Faridūn, but also from Mānush-chehr; he, therefore, indisputably belongs through this extraction to the royal family of Irān. The genealogical table is given us in the *Bundehesh* (79, 5), and in a later prayer called the *Dhup-nīreng* or Fumigation-

prayer, and lastly by Masudi. According to these sources, the genealogical table may be exhibited in the following manner:—

Bundehesh	Dhup-nîreng	Masudi	
Manoshchihr	Mînochehr	Menouchehr (منوچهر)	
Durâsrûn	Durânsroun	Dourshrin (دورشرين)	
[Dûrâsrob]			
Rajan	Rezeshné	Irej (ارج)	
Ayazem	Ezem	Haizem (هایزم)	
Vîdast	Vedest	Wandest (واندست)	
Spetâmân	Sepetaméh�	Espimân (اسپیامان)	
Hardâr	Herdar�	Herdâr (هردار)	
Harshn	Herdereshné	Arhadas (ارحدس)	
[Hardarshn]			
Paitarasp	Petarasp	Bât�r (باتیر)	
Chasnush	Chakhshenosh	Hakhish (حکیش)	
[Chakhshnush]			
Haechadasp	Hechedasp	HejdASF (هجدسف)	
Spitarasp	Orouedasp	Arikdasf (اریکدسف)	
[Aurvadasp]			
.....	Peterasp	FederASF (فدراسف)	
[Paitirasp]			
Purushasp	Poroshasp	BourshASF (بورشسف)	
Zartusht	Zartusht	Zarâdusht (زرادشت) ¹	

¹ [This genealogy is somewhat differently given in the *Dinkard*, bk. VII., as well as in the text of the *Vajarkarde-dini* (pp. 28, 29) published by Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana in 1848 (*Cf.* "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 141, by Dr. West):—

"Pôrûshasp, son of Paitîritrâsp, son of Uru-gadasp (Urvadasp), Haechadasp, Chikhsh-nush, Paetrip (Paretirasp), Arejadarshne (Hardarshn), Hardâr, Spîtâmân, Vaedeshta, Nyâzem, Airij (Razishn), Dûrâsrobân, Mâ-nûshchihr ruler of Irân, Mânûshkhûrnâr, Mânûshkhûrnâk, Nêryôsang, Varzidêdin, Vizâk,

Whilst the first row from Zoroaster to Mānoschihr counts 13 members, the second one represents 14, the name Orouedasp (*Aurvāt-aspā*) being there inserted. We also observe that the second row contains the name Peterasp twice, once in the usual place corresponding with that which it holds in the Bundehesh, and the second time immediately before Purushaspa in the place where the Bundehesh reads Spitarasp; the latter reading may be the correct one. Masudi agrees with the second table. M. Windischmann has already proved that the Avesta gives to Zoroaster the same line of ancestors. It is true that, though not all, yet several names of the ancestors do occur, most frequently *Spitama*, next *Chakhshni* (Yt. XIII. 114), *Haechat-aspā* (Ys. LII. 3), while *Pōurushaspa* also is frequently called the father of Zoroaster. We can here even point out, as far as is needful, his collateral relations. The Bundehesh informs us (79, 8) that Paitirasp or Spitarasp had two sons—the one was Pourushasp, the father of Zoroaster, the second was Ārāsta from whom a son Maidhyōmāh descended, and this account is confirmed by Yt. XIII. 95, where we find mention made of *Maidhyōmāh*, son of Ārāsta. The mother of Zoroaster, according to the Bundehesh and the Zartusht-nāme, is named Dugdha,¹ and her parents, according to the book first-named, Frahi and Mrava, names which

Airyāk, Ithritāk, Ibitāk, Frazishāk, Zishāk, Frasizāk, Izāk, Airij, Fare dun lord of Qaniras, Pūrtorā Āspigān, Nevaktorā Āspigān, Sōgtorā Āspigān, Gefartorā Āspigān, Vanoeffavashn Āspigān, Yima lord of the seven regions, &c." *Tr. n.*]

¹ [This name is written somewhat differently in the *Dinkard*, bk. VII:—*Va ajash goft Pōrūshasp val Dugdūban*, "And so Porushasp said unto Dukduban." *Tr. n.*]

are not to be found again in the Avesta. By this genealogy the royal descent of Zoroaster is at all events established beyond question.

Not merely a kingly, but to a certain extent a divine, origin is ascribed to Zoroaster in an account which we find in Shāhrastāni.¹ God, as it is therein said, had placed the spirit (the *frōhar* or *fravashi*) of Zoroaster in a tree (*Haoma?*), which He had caused to grow on the uppermost heaven, and which He afterwards transplanted to the summit of a mountain in ĀdARBAIJĀN, which is called Ismuvicār.² There, it is also said, God had mixed the personality (here the *frōhar* is likely again meant) of Zoroaster with the milk of a cow, which the father of Zoroaster had drunk; out of this was afterwards formed the seed, and then a piece of flesh in the womb of Zoroaster's mother.³ Be that as it may, the legend affirms that the importance of her son was previously announced to the mother in a dream, a circumstance which we have often noticed in the Irānian traditions. When Dughda was in the fifth month of her pregnancy, she saw a terrible apparition in her dream. It appeared to her as if a thick cloud was raining on her house tigers, lions, wolves, dragons, serpents, and other noxious beasts, and amongst these wild animals one, that was larger and more frightful than the rest, appeared as if it were tearing the child out of her womb in order to kill it. While the mother gazes on this scene in great amazement, her child raises its voice to console her: demons of the above description are unable to injure it.

¹ Vol. I. 281 of Haarbrücker's Translation.

² I consider the name Ismuvicār to be erroneously written for a more ancient Asnavandgar, and believe that the Savelan is here meant.

³ [Similar facts relating to Zoroaster's miraculous birth are also narrated in the *Dinkard*.]

Indeed, its words have scarcely ended, when a mountain of light is seen descending from heaven, before which a large number of the creatures of darkness at once take to flight. As the light draws nearer, there issues out of it a handsome youth, who holds a staff in his left hand, and a manuscript in his right. At the sight of this manuscript the infernal beings still remaining withdraw with the exception of three—a wolf, a lion, and a panther; at last even they cannot hold their ground as soon as the youth inclines his rod towards them. When Dughda awakes, she hastens in confusion to a wise interpreter of dreams, who is, however, unable to expound at once her wonderful vision, and therefore tells her to return to him within three days. When she calls upon him again at the appointed time, he communicates to her that the child, with which she has been pregnant for 5 months and 23 days, will turn out a man of great consequence. The dark cloud and the mountain of light, which had appeared to her in the dream, signify that she and her son will have to endure at first much calamity from tyrants and similar wicked beings, but that they will overcome all dangers in the end. The staff which the youth held in his hand signified the Majesty of God, that turned against the oppressors. The manuscript in the other hand was the symbol of the prophetic dignity which would fall to the lot of her son. The three beasts that remained were the three most implacable enemies of Zoroaster, yet even they would finally have to give way.

The early life of the Irānian Prophet also consists of a series of wonders. When Zoroaster was born, a time at which other children are wont to cry, he laughed,¹ and by

¹ [Compare the *Dinkard*, bk. VII.]

اَئِنْكَمْ سَلْتَمْ سَلْتَمْ سَلْتَمْ (سَلْتَمْ سَلْتَمْ) سَلْتَمْ سَلْتَمْ سَلْتَمْ

Aēvak aē pētāk aighash (Zartūhsht) pavan zarkhunashnē barā khāndīd: "It is also manifest (from the good religion) that he (Zoroaster) laughed at his birth."—Tr. n.]

such extraordinary behaviour drew at once upon him the attention of the whole district. Such is the *first marvel* in his history. The demons, who naturally knew very well the object of Zoroaster's mission, and who, in order to thwart it, endeavoured to destroy the author of their fear, employed every means to annihilate him, and more than once opportunity seemed to favour them. The province, in which Zoroaster was born, belonged to a king Durānsarūn, of whom we know not whether he was identical with the Durāsrūn mentioned above in the table of Zoroaster's genealogy. This king was an unbeliever and the chief of all vicious magicians (*yātu*), for every one then dealt in magic according to the statement of the *Zartusht-nāme*. The powers of darkness often carried on intercourse with men, and confirmed them in their wicked purposes; even the father of Zoroaster did not hold himself entirely aloof from such dealings.¹ Now, when Durānsarūn heard of Zoroaster's birth, and feared that the power of sorcery might come to an end if the child grew up to strength, he speedily hastened towards the dwelling of Pōurūshaspa, where he found the child lying in its cradle. Fiercely he drew his poniard to murder the child, but before he could inflict the fatal blow his hand was paralyzed, and he was compelled to withdraw without having effected his object. Such was the *second wonder*. The evil spirits, however, did not yet abandon their game so tamely; they long hoped that their evil designs might prevail in the end. They soon formed a design for stealing the child from his mother, and brought Zoroaster into the desert, where they piled up a heap of burning materials around him and set them on fire. Thus they confidently expected to annihilate him, but they were again deceived; the child slept calmly

¹ Especially according to the legend extant. But Dastur Peshotōnji Behramji here justly remarks that the Avesta itself does not support that opinion.

in the fire, and the mother hastening into the desert in search of her lost child found him again. This is the *third wonder*. Not long after this vain attempt, the sorcerers made a fresh effort. By the command of Durānsarūn they took the child and laid it on a narrow path, over which had to pass a herd of oxen under whose feet they hoped that it would be trampled to death; but, when the herd approached, the largest of the bulls took the child between his feet, and prevented any injury being done to it. This is the *fourth wonder*. The *fifth wonder* is really a mere repetition of the preceding. What the oxen had refused to do, was tried again with horses. The child was, therefore, again laid on a narrow path and a herd of wild horses driven over it, but this time a horse protected the child from the hoofs of the others. Next, as domestic animals could not be made to do any harm to Zoroaster, Durānsarūn strove to do so by means of wild beasts. He ordered a den of wolves to be discovered, and the young ones thereof to be slain during the absence of the old ones, and Zoroaster was laid in their place in the hope that the old wolves might in their first fury tear the child to pieces. These children of darkness did, indeed, show a great inclination to do so, but God closed their jaws, so that they could not hurt the child. On the contrary, there came two celestial cows which gave their udders to the child and suckled it. Such was the *sixth wonder* through which the life of Zoroaster was preserved.¹

After these fruitless endeavours all plans to destroy Zoroaster's life had to be given up as hopeless. The latter now gradually grew up in age, and his father found it necessary to have him educated. He selected as teacher a man who led a pious life in the midst of magicians and whose name was Barzinkarūs. When Zoroaster was

¹ *Vide the Dinkard, bk. VII.*

seven years old, the sorcerers made a fresh attempt against him. They hoped that he would not be insensible at least to fears and terrors; and, therefore, they, by means of hellish witchcraft, brought forth terrible apparitions, at which all were startled and took to flight, with the exception of Zoroaster, who remained perfectly calm in his firm confidence in the protecting power of God. Thus he also passed through this trial, which is usually reckoned as the *seventh wonder*. Not long after this Zoroaster fell sick, and now the magicians hoped to destroy him. Instead of medicine they brought him some drink prepared from poisonous drugs; but Zoroaster immediately detecting its dangerous nature rejected it, and was again preserved. This may be regarded as the *eighth wonder*. It may have been in the fifteenth year of Zoroaster's life, that his father gave a sumptuous banquet at his house to which King Durānsarūn and Burāntarūs, the most noted magician of the time, were also invited. Here Zoroaster took the opportunity of openly expressing his hatred of magic, and of proclaiming war against it. Henceforth the magicians trembled in his presence, and watched him attentively. His further deeds are, however, not handed down to us; still it is self-evident that his life was entirely blameless. It is only said that the period of his trials lasted up to his thirtieth year, after which his piety began to bring forth fruit.

Of all the wonderful incidents which are recounted in the legend drawn from the history of Zoroaster's youth, we are able to quote only for one the evidence of earlier antiquity, namely, the circumstance that Zoroaster laughed at his birth, which is related already by Plinius and Solinus.¹ By this it is not naturally proved that all

¹ Plinius, *Hist. nat.* VII. 16:—“Risiisse eodem die, quo genitus esset, unum hominem accepimus Zoroastrem. Eidem cerebrum ita palpitasse ut impositam repelleret manum, futurae praesagio sapien-

the rest of the wonders were also known to the ancients; however, it is at least probable that such may have been the case with one or the other of them. The Avesta relates very little concerning the history of Zoroaster's youth. It is true M. Anquetil affirms that he has found in Ys. XLII. 8 an allusion to the hardships endured by the Prophet in his younger days; but we believe that the passage referred to should be understood differently. So also with regard to the 19th chapter of the Vendīdād, which could here be cited with much probability, but which we would rather appeal to for another and later exploit. The later narratives of Mahomedans show a partial knowledge of these events; thus the writer Shāhrastāni, already quoted, who has related the previous wonders of the horses and the wolves, also asserts that Zoroaster cured a blind person in Dīnāver by means of a herb which he caused to be pressed upon the eyes of the patient. The laughing at the time of birth was likewise known to Shāhrastāni as well as to the historian Mirkhond; the latter also knew of the wonderful dream which had visited Zoroaster's mother. Finally, a passage in a scholion to Plato's "Alcibiades,"¹ makes it very probable that the importance of the numbers seven, fifteen, and thirty in the history of Zoroaster's youth was recognized even in ancient times.

We now turn to the continuation of Zoroaster's biography.

"Zoroaster is the only man of whom we have heard that he laughed on the very day of his birth. His brain also is said to have throbbed so violently that no hand could be laid upon his head—a presage of future wisdom." Similarly Solinus, c. l.: "*Itaque unum novimus eadem hora risisse, qua erat natus, scilicet Zoroastrem mox optimarum artium peritissimum.*" "And so we know that one man laughed at the very hour in which he was born, namely, Zoroaster, afterwards most highly skilled in the best arts."

¹ For the passage referred to, *vide* Windischmann, *Zorast. Studien*, p. 275, note.

phy after his thirtieth year, and to his real prophetic career. But here our legend appears to be somewhat incomplete. It is manifestly concerned only with the work of Zoroaster in Bactria, and is silent concerning his activity in other parts. At this point the Bundehesh (79, 11), expressly tells us that Zoroaster promulgated his religion first of all in Aryana-vaija, and hence it becomes still more probable that, according to the view of the Avesta-followers, we should look in that country for the birth-place of Zoroaster; for, if he had been born in Urumia or even in some other region, we should have been told that the Prophet had travelled to Aryana-vaija. Of an immigration to Aryana-vaija the narrative knows nothing, while it probably speaks of an emigration from that country. The Bundehesh further relates that the first man, who accepted the Law of Zoroaster, was his uncle Maidhyōmāo,¹ and this statement is also confirmed by the Avesta (Yt. XIII. 95). In other respects, however, we may presume that his doctrine did not find any great sympathy in Aryana-vaija, since he determined to emigrate with his true adherents. This removal is now described more in detail by the legend, according to which Zoroaster and his followers, after having travelled for some time, came to a sea which had to be crossed; but no vessel could be found anywhere, and Zoroaster thought it indecent that his companions, amongst whom there were also females, should undress themselves. A miracle helped to overcome this difficulty. As Zoroaster stretched forth his hands in prayer the water divided of itself, and the faithful marched through it dry-shod. MM. Anquetil and Ménant believe the sea here alluded to to be the Araxes, and this is quite possible, assuming, as is indeed the case, that large rivers

¹ *Yo · paoiryō · Zarathushtrāi · māthremcha · gushta sāsnāoscha,*
“who first listened unto the Sacred Word and Teaching of Zara-thushtra.”

in the Irānian country are described as seas. We, however, prefer to understand thereby Lake Sevān, that is, in case this expedition of the legend should prove to be an old one, for which there is no particular evidence yet available. Even after the sea abovenamed was crossed Zoroaster and his followers did not yet find themselves within the limits of Irān; he still marched onward for the whole month of Spandārmat, the last month of the year, and first reached the Irānian borders on the day of Anérān, the last day of the aforesaid month. There a festival was being celebrated at the very time, and Zoroaster was amongst the partakers in the feast. M. Anquetil believes this festival to have been that of Farvardyān; but that festival is an institution of Zoroaster, and we are unable to believe that it could have been already solemnized by the Irānians before they professed the *Mazdayasnān* religion. I believe, therefore, with M. Ménant, that the New-Year Festival is the one referred to.

During the night after this feast Zoroaster had a dream full of the most auspicious intimations of his future success in Irān. It appeared to him as though he saw in the East a countless host moving towards him with hostile intent. It surrounded him on all sides, and did not leave him any room for escape. Then suddenly another army appeared coming from the South, which put the eastern one to flight. The interpretation of this dream is tolerably simple: the magicians and the followers of the Aḡrō Mainyu will take all pains to hinder the dissemination of Zoroaster's doctrine; but the latter will triumphantly overcome all obstacles. Only, it is striking that the relieving army appears from the South, since the South is, according to the general notion of the Irānians, a region which pertains to the evil beings. Should this portion of the legend be ancient, the friendly army must have been regarded in the earlier ages as having come from the West. At the close of the festival Zoroaster continued his march, and

came again to a large river, the Dāitya, on the day *Dai-pā-mihr* after the beginning of the year. This name does not in any case designate the Caspian Sea as M. Anquetil supposes, but the Araxes or Kur.¹ It must, therefore, be assumed that a part of the country on the left bank of that river was at an early period regarded as belonging to Irān, because Zoroaster found himself already within the limits of that country when he had reached the banks of the Dāitya. But, perhaps, the crossing of the Dāitya is wholly to be omitted in the passage in question, and this river is identical with that sea of whose miraculous crossing we have already heard.

Now, on the soil of Irān, begins the real prophetic career of Zoroaster, his communion with heaven, and the revelations imparted to him. There appears to him the Ameshaspend Vohu-manō who introduces him to Ahura Mazda, from Whom Zoroaster obtains permission to submit certain questions. The first question which is put by Zoroaster is: '*Which of God's creatures is the best on earth?*' Whereto he receives the answer: '*He is the best of all men who is pure of heart.*' Then he inquires about the names and duties of the angels, about the nature of Aḡrō Mainyü, which evil spirit is then shown to him in hell, and is reported to have spoken on that occasion the words contained in Vd. XIX. 21.² Thereupon Zoroaster is favoured by God with various miraculous signs. He sees a fiery mountain and is commanded to pass through the fire. He does so and suffers not the slightest hurt thereby, not a hair of his head is singed. After this his body is opened and the entrails taken out; these are then replaced in the body which is again closed and Zoroaster is alive as before [?]. At last melted ore is poured

¹ *Vide Justi, Beiträge I, 12. 18. 2, 22 and Eran. Alterthums.*
bk. I. p. 200.

² "Do not slay my (wicked) creatures, O pure Zarathushtra!"

over his breast without his feeling any pain. Zoroaster forthwith learns the allegorical import of these acts. He is enjoined to explain to men that those who turn towards Ahriman (*Agrō Mainyu*), must wander in a fire as large as the one through which he himself has passed, that just as his body was opened so also will streams of blood flow from their bodies. That melted ore was poured on Zoroaster's breast without his being injured by it is said to have been a prophecy respecting Āderbāt Māhrespand, on whom the same trial was inflicted without his thereby suffering any injury.

After this Zoroaster receives the Avesta from God, with His order to go to the court of king Vishtāspa (*Gushtāsp*), and to proclaim it there. When Zoroaster receives God's permission to depart, the different Amesha-spends approach him in order to communicate their respective counsels. These are the same commands and prohibitions as are also given in the *Rivāiets* and *Patets*. Vohu-manō commands him to bid mankind take great care of domestic animals and especially not to kill lambs without any need. Asha-vahishta recommends the tending of the fire and fire-altars. Khshathra-vairyā orders the care of metals, lest they grow rusty. Spentā-ārmaiti forbids the pollution of the earth with blood and other impure substances, and recommends on the contrary its cultivation. Haurvatāt entrusts Zoroaster and his adherents with the care of water, Ameretāt with that of plants and trees.

No point in Zoroastrian legend can be better attested from ancient sources than the dialogues between Zoroaster and Ahura Mazda. One of the principal passages is Ys. XIII. 20, where mention is expressly made of their meetings; in other places it is only hinted that Ahura Mazda announced certain doctrines to Zoroaster, which the latter proclaimed to the rest of men, (*vide* Vsp. II. 3, XIII. 2, Ys. LXX. 65). Properly speaking, the whole Avesta is a proof of this statement, for it is therein mentioned, in

connection with any matter in any way important, how Zoroaster questioned Ahura Mazda upon it, and what precise answer he received in return. From the Gāthās I might here cite Ys. XLII., XLIII., where Zoroaster is represented in converse with Ahura Mazda.¹ According to the *Zartusht-nāme*, the conferences took place in Heaven—hence in the *Garōnmāna*—but M. Anquetil has already pointed to Vd. XXII. 53, as if their conversations had been held upon a mountain. The same is also reported by later writers, and among others by Mir-khond,² who says that Zoroaster retired to a mountain in the vicinity of Ardebil, from which place he returned with the Avesta. This mountain seems to be the Savelon.³ Of the retreat of Zoroaster into solitude the ancients also had some knowledge to record; they even admit his sojourn upon a mountain,⁴ which is said to have afterwards burst into flames, and whither the king of Persia approached with the most select portion of the Persian nobility; but Zoroaster came out of this fire unhurt, and gracefully conversed with those people, and enjoined them to be of good cheer, and to make certain offerings. Thenceforth he did not hold further communication with the people, but only with those who were most susceptible of truth and competent to deal with questions regarding the Deity. The statements of other ancient

¹ Dastur Peshotonji Behramji refers to the passage Ys. XLII. 7, as treating of the conference of Zoroaster with Vohu-manō before his conversation with Ahura Mazda.

² *Vide* p. 286 in Shea's Translation.

³ *Vide* Lagarde, *Ges. Abhandlungen*, p. 171.

⁴ *Chrysost. Orat. Boryst*, p. 448. [A similar narrative is found besides in the Old Testament, Exodus, XIX. 3-18, where it is said that when "Moses went down from the mount (Sinai) unto the people and it came to pass on the third day in the morning that there were thunders and lightnings, and

chroniclers are of similar import.¹ In them the legend of Zoroaster appears to be marred by a long *hiatus*; probably a multitude of deeds were related in earlier times, which Zoroaster was supposed to have accomplished in Media. The Zoroastrian legend, as we possess it, even in its oldest form, is founded on the appearance of Zoroaster in Balkh at the court of Gushtāsp, and passes over the former narratives as unimportant.

When Zoroaster, holding the Sacred Volume (*viz.*, the Avesta) in his hand, returns from his consultation with Ahura Mazda, the evil spirits and the sorcerers hazard yet one last attempt against him in order to divert him, if possible, from the right path. Now he is too powerful to be defeated by them, nevertheless they beseech him to renounce the Avesta. Zoroaster listens to them with perfect contempt, and begins to recite the Avesta, whereupon the evil spirits are forced to fly and some of them are destroyed. This is, according to my view, the event alluded to in the 19th chapter of the Vendidād. According to the Zartusht-nāme, Zoroaster received the order while in heaven to present himself at the court of Gushtāsp, whither he now departs after defeating the demons and the magicians. This order to go to the court of Gushtāsp is also confirmed by the Avesta, as we may observe from Ys. XV. 14; but, according to Chaps. XLIV., XLV. of the same book, it appears as though Zoroaster had made an effort even at an earlier period in some other provinces of the

a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, and the mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire."]

¹ *Plin. Hist. N. XI.* 42, 97. "Tradunt Zoroastrem in desertis caseo vixisse annis XXX. ita temperato ut vetustatem non sentiret."

"They say that Zoroaster lived thirty years in the desert on cheese so preserved as not to feel the effect of time."—*Plutarch, Quaest. Symp. IV. I.* p. 660.

Irānian empire. With the Avesta we must also believe that Zoroaster had formed his resolution in Aryana-vaija to go to the court of king Vishtāspa, for it is shown by Yt. V. 104, 105, that he had already offered sacrifices to Ardvi-sūra in the same district to induce the latter to assist him in his alliance with Vishtāspa. Elsewhere also Vishtāspa and his whole family are well known to the Avesta, as M. Windischmann¹ has sufficiently proved. However, it does not altogether follow, that the legend always regarded Gushtāsp as dwelling in Balkh. Hamza and Qazvini would rather place their meeting in Ātropātene.² Khondemir affirms that Gushtāsp dwelt in Istakhr. The ordinary belief, however, is that Zoroaster repaired to Balkh, and that there he was received in a solemn council by Gushtāsp.³ The wise men who were present at the king's court endeavoured to refute him. Thirty on his right hand and thirty on his left were all compelled to withdraw in confusion, and had to confess that a foreigner had conquered them in argument. This mental superiority disposed the king from the very beginning to favour the Prophet, and in consequence increased the envious desire of those who had previously shone in court through their wisdom still to uphold their former position. But Zoroaster also proved victorious in the second and the third day's discourse. Now when none of the sages could maintain their ground against Zoroaster, the latter made himself known as a prophet; the Avesta began to receive favour in the eyes of the king, and claimed acceptance. But the king, having listened to some

¹ *Zoroast. Studien*, p. 55.

² Hamza, p. 36, ed. Gottw. اَتَاه زَرْدَشْت آذْرِبِیْجَان Qazvīni II. 267 ed. Wüstenf.

³ That Zoroaster entered by the roof into the council hall of Gushtāsp in a supernatural manner is not mentioned by the *Zartusht-nāme*, but probably by Qazvīni. Comp. also Hyde, *Historia vet. Pers.* p. 320, 2nd ed.

portions of the Book; was not convinced as yet of the truth of its contents, and willing to consider the matter more maturely, he demanded that Zoroaster should remain at his court until further orders; and the latter was content with this preliminary success. However, even at this court his persecutions were not at an end. The wise men, once so highly esteemed, could not console themselves in their discomfiture, and endeavoured to raise suspicions against the Prophet in the mind of the king. They bribed the porter of his house and (during his absence) dragged therein unclean things, such as heads of dogs, cats, &c., whilst they also concealed some under his clothes. Then they alleged before their king that Zoroaster was nothing better than an impure sorcerer. The king was very angry, when, on more minute inquiry, these impure things were found in Zoroaster's dwelling, and he ordered him to be imprisoned. The time had now come for the Prophet to prove his divine mission by a miracle. The king had a black horse which he used to ride almost always, and which was also very dear to him. When, after these events, the keeper entered the stall, he observed with terror that the horse had lost his four feet, which had 'gone back into the body[?].' He informed the king at once of this occurrence, and the latter having convinced himself of the truth of the report, called in all the wise men; but they were unable either to advise or to help. In the meantime Zoroaster lies in his prison, and knows nothing of these events; but on this day of general distress the jailor forgets to bring him his dinner, which causes him in the evening to inquire what has taken place. As soon as he is made aware of the accident, he prevails upon the waiter to go the next morning before the king, and to announce to him that Zoroaster is ready to help under certain conditions. The king, who is helpless, suffers Zoroaster to be called, and inquires as to his conditions. The Prophet proposes four, so that on the fulfilment of

each of them depends the re-appearance of one of the horse's feet. The first condition is that Gushtāsp shall firmly believe in the Prophet Zoroaster, and the divinity of his doctrine ; as soon as this is done the first foot of the horse re-appears. The second condition is that Isfandiār,¹ the son of Gushtāsp, shall devote himself entirely to the defence of the Zoroastrian faith ; as soon as Isfandiār has given the necessary assurances the second foot also shows itself. The third condition is that the wife of Gushtāsp shall also accept the Law ; this is at once proclaimed in the queen's chambers and she professes belief ;² whereupon the third foot of the horse makes its appearance. Lastly, the fourth condition Zoroaster stipulates for on his own behalf ; the circumstances which led to his imprisonment are to be minutely inquired into. This inquiry proves favourable to Zoroaster, for the door-keeper now confesses having been suborned by the Prophet's enemies to introduce the unclean things found in Zoroaster's house. The Prophet is forgiven, while the instigators are punished. Now the fourth foot of the horse also re-appears, and Zoroaster attains to merited reverence.

The *Mazdayasnān* Law is now in such great honour with Gushtāsp, that the king does nothing without consulting the Prophet. The miracle of the horse is also narrated by

¹ The name Isfandiār is also not unknown to the Avesta, but it occurs there in its strictly altered form, *Spentodāta* (Yt. XIII. 103).

² In the Avesta also the wife of Vishtāspa appears as a patroness of Zoroaster. She is therein called Hutaosa, a name which might perhaps be compared with the Greek *Aiōssa*. In Yt. IX. we find Zarathushtra praying that she may co-operate with him in his meditation upon the Law. In Yt. XV. 53, she herself appears supplicating for the love of Vishtāspa. She must be identical with the Katāyūn of the Shāh-nāme ; but as the whole of the latter narrative is based on a weak foundation, it is not impossible that the author of the Avesta, as the earlier one, should ascribe to her another origin.

Shāhrastāni. Mirkhond¹ relates it quite in the same manner, though more briefly. One day Gushtāsp declares to his Prophet his intention of praying to God for four things: Firstly, that he may be shown the place which he will occupy in Paradise. Secondly, that his body may become invulnerable in war. Thirdly, that he may participate in the knowledge of all things which have already taken place or are yet to happen in the world. Fourthly and lastly, that his soul shall not be separated from his body until the resurrection. Zoroaster replies that those four requests may indeed be granted but not to one and the same person, that the king should, therefore, choose which of the four requests he would desire for his own person; the three remaining wishes might be distributed amongst three different individuals. Gushtāsp thereupon selects the first of the wishes for himself. There appear before him four existences of the spiritual world, *Ādar Khordād*, *Ādar Gushasp*, and the two Amesha-spends, *Bahman* and *Ardibihisht*. They exhort the king not to fear; but the latter is so terrified by the appearance of the celestial beings, that he falls down from his throne, and cannot recover himself for a long time. Then Zoroaster performs the *Darūn-offering* with wine, fragrant flowers, milk, and pomegranates. He gives some of the wine to Gushtāsp to drink, who directly falls asleep and beholds in a dream Paradise and the place which is there destined for him. Peshotan receives the milk, and becomes thereby immortal. Jāmāsp receives the perfumes, and to his lot falls wisdom, which Gushtāsp had before desired for himself. Finally, Zoroaster gives some grains of the pomegranate to Isfandiār, and his

¹ Shāhrastāni, vol. I. p. 283 of the German translation, speaks only of the fore-feet of the horse, which again became free when Zoroaster was released from prison. Mirkhond (in Shea, p. 287) narrates the wonder as above, only more briefly.

body becomes thereby invulnerable. By these successive miracles the belief of Gushtāsp becomes more and more strengthened, and at this time the event narrated in Ys. IX. 46 is said to have happened, namely, the disappearance of the demons underground. At this time also Gushtāsp is said to have erected the first fire-temple. Inconsistent as these legends do appear at the first glance, there is every probability that they are in the main very ancient. We have previously had occasion to mention Peshotan as the spiritual guide of Isfandiār; as son of Vishtāspa and as immortal he is also known to the Bundehesh (p. 68). The Shāh-nāme also informs us that Isfandiār became invulnerable through Zoroaster, though in a somewhat different manner, by means of a chain which he had received (Shāh-nāme 1134). Jāmāsp is also represented in the Avesta as very wise. In the *Jamāsp-nāme*, which is certainly modern, he appears, quite as in the Avesta, in the possession of the knowledge of the past and of the future. The narrative of the erection of the fire-temple seems to follow the account given in the 17th chapter of the Bundehesh. Even in the Book of Kings Dakiki also relates that Gushtāsp erected a temple to the Fire *Méhr-burzin* or *Burzin-méhr*,¹ and that this fire has since burnt without smoke. It is this fire which we know from the Bundehesh to be the third of the holy fires, the fire of husbandmen; and it is said to have settled during Gushtāsp's reign on the mountain Raevañta in Khorāsān, after it had travelled throughout the world without any permanent resting-place. But, according to the same authority, the Fire *Frobā*, the Fire of priests, which had its temple until then on a mountain in Khuârizm, is also said to have been brought thence into Kâbulistân. Shâhrastâni² indeed differs here. He

¹ Not to be confounded with the Fire *Burzin*, which was worshipped by Lohrasp.

² I. 299. On the other hand, Hamza says that Gushtāsp built a city in the district of Dârâbgerd, which he named رام و شناسیان.

affirms that this Fire of Khuârizm was carried to Dârâbgerd in Persepolis. The transference of this Fire of the priesthood from West to East may perhaps not have been universally believed in Irân, but can only stand in connection with the Bactrian conception of the Zoroastrian legend which we have before us. As Zoroaster emigrated from his native country and met with a hospitable reception from Gushtâsp, so also the Fire of the priests, who belonged to him and from whom they had emanated, must have travelled with him towards the East.

The Zartusht-nâme, our principal source of information for the history of Zoroaster, does not relate his biography, but the history of Gushtâsp's conversion; it therefore breaks off at this point. We shall further on treat of the few chapters that still follow. Regarding the storys of miracles, which we have reported, we believe we have shown that they must be considerably ancient, at least in their main features. Yet we observe from the different statements of Mahomedan authors, that a number of other miracles of Zoroaster, of which we know nothing at present, were recorded in earlier times. Thus Mirkhond¹ narrates that Zoroaster had a fire which he could hold in his hand without injuring himself, and that the Fire of the Magi (the above-named Âdar Frâ) originated from it. The same historiographer further relates that Zoroaster suffered molten metal to be poured on his breast without being burnt thereby. More important than the above is the statement of Firdûsi, that Gushtâsp planted a cypress-tree in Kishmir, which in the course of years grew to such an enormous height, that no lasso could reach it, and that over the tree he had caused a magnificent temple to be erected, calling upon all his subjects to go to the

(properly read رام و شناسپات), may be the present city of Fasâ (Hamza, p. 37, ed. Gottw.).

¹ Mirkhond, (ed. Shea) pp. 286 seq.

temple, and to offer their worship to the tree, which they accordingly did. Later accounts assert that when the Khalif Muttavakkel caused that miraculous tree to be felled, no less than 2,000 sheep and bullocks could find room underneath it, and that 300 camels were required for its removal.¹ It is evident that this enormous tree cannot have been a cypress, for though there may have been large cypresses, still they cannot grow to the size which is supposed in that account. To this it may be added that it cannot be proved that the cypress is esteemed in the religion of Zoroaster as a sacred tree, though there are some traces which show that such may have been the case further to the West of Irān. However, all this is easily explained if we assume that Buddhism is here mistaken for Zoroastrianism. The Indian fig-tree, the *ficus religiosa*, which sends new roots out of its branches into the earth, does indeed extend itself to a circumference as large as that described by the legend. This tree is regarded as sacred, especially by the Buddhists, for they believe that under its shadow the founder of their religion was invested with the dignity of Buddha. They have also the custom of sending sprigs of that holy tree to converted countries, and of erecting temples by their side.² We have a detailed description of the transportation of the sacred tree to Ceylon, and we can as well assume that such twigs were also sent to Bactria after Buddhism had spread in that country. Where, too, we have to look for Kishmir and the so-called cypress, has already been said above. Far later than the legend above cited is another one respecting the contest of Zoroaster with the wise Chengrenghācha, an Indian Brāhmin, who went to Irān with the design of conquering Zoroaster; but as soon as he had listened to the Avesta, was turned from an enemy

¹ Vuller's, *Fragmente über die Religion Zoroasters*, pp. 71, 113.

² Comp. Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumsk.* I. 257.

into a zealous adherent of the Prophet. This episode in the legend of Zoroaster was accepted in earlier times, because it was believed to be confirmed by the Avesta. However, this is erroneous, and M. Bréal has strikingly proved,¹ that Chengrengħācha was no other than Sankara-āchārya, who was renowned in India, and to whom a *Digvijaya*, i.e. a conquest of different territories was ascribed. Besides, this famous Brāhmin lived in the eighth century of our era; he could not, therefore, have met Zoroaster.

All that now remains for us to speak of concerns the personal circumstances of Zoroaster in the court at Balkh. M. Anquetil has collected the necessary materials on this point, and later on M. Windischmann has so fully treated the subject, that I shall have to recall only what is already known. Besides the royal family, the frequently-named king Vishtāspa or Gushtāsp and his wife Hutaosa, Zoroaster also enjoyed friendly intercourse with the minister of the king, Jāmāspa, of the family of Hvôgva or Hvôva. We find him named in Ys. XIII. 24, XLV. 17, XLVIII. 9, L. 18, and Yt V. 68 *seq.* In the last passage is described his victory over the demons. He stood on similar good terms with Frashaostra, the brother of Jāmāspa, (*vide* Ys. XIII. 24, XXVIII. 8, XLV. 16, XLVIII. 8, L. 17, LII. 2.) . . . We learn from the Bundehesh (80, 1 *seq.*) that Zoroaster had three wives, one after another. By his first wife, whose name is not mentioned, he had a son Isatvāstra, and three daughters—Freni, Thriti, and Pouruchistā; by a second wife were born two other sons Hvarechithra and Urvatarnara. From these three sons the three orders of priests, warriors, and husbandmen are said to have originated.² All

¹ *Vide Journal Asiatique*, 1862, p. 497.

² Though great pains have been taken to place the legend of Zoroaster in harmony with the heroic tradition, this passage, which

these names are also known to the Avesta, (*vide* Ys. XXIII. 4, XXVI. 17, Yt. XIII. 98, 139). The third wife of Zoroaster, being descended from the family of Hvôva, is generally named Hvôvi, (*vide* Yt. XIII. 139). Her children are not mentioned. In the Bundehesh (80, 7 *seq.*), it is said that Zoroaster thrice coupled with Hvôvi, thrice his seed fell over the earth, the *yazata* Nairyosâgha preserved it, and entrusted it to the protection of Anâhita, until the time shall have come when there shall spring therefrom the three future Saviours: Oshédar, Oshédar-mâh, and Soshios. The mother of the last one is called in Yt. XIX. 92, Vîspa-taurvi. These posthumous sons are also familiar to the Avesta, as clearly appears from Yt. XIII. 62, 128, 129.¹

The accounts of Zoroaster's death shew little uniformity. Here we must again make a distinction between Occidental and Oriental accounts. The former reports are considerably more modern. Only Suidas and the Chronicon Alexandrinum give any information of the event, and assume that Zoroaster was consumed by a supernatural fire and received back into heaven.² Amongst Oriental

entirely contradicts the earlier accounts given by us, appears to me to prove that the legend originally assumes a different genesis of the world than the Irânian heroic legend does, and consequently has no connection with the latter.

¹ The *Vajarkard*, which is indeed apocryphal, (in p. 21, 22, ed. Bombay), agrees with the rest of the statements, with the remark that the mother of Isatvâstra and the three daughters was called Urvij, that the second wife was a widow, named Arnij Baredâ, whose first husband was called Matunaibâr (Mihryâr).

² *Quod Zoroastres precatus est, ut moriturus fulmine ictus interiret: et Persis denuntiavit, ubi me ignis caelensis consumserit, ossium meorum crematorum cineres servate, et quamdiu hoc facitis, regnum a vobis non aufertur: quod fecerunt. Ille autem, invocato Orione, a caelesti flamma depastus interiit.* "For Zoroaster prayed that when his hour approached, he might die by lightning; and he said to the Persians: 'When the heavenly fire has consumed

writers only Masudi and Dastur Peshotanji Behramji express their opinion as to Zoroaster's death. The former (vol. II. p. 127, ed. Paris) simply says:—"He died in the seventy-seventh year of his life." With this the Dastur agrees; but he also adds that the event took place on the 11th day (Khorshed) of the tenth month (Dai), and that Zoroaster suffered martyrdom at the taking of Balkh by Arjāsp, (of whom we shall hear further on), on the same occasion when Lohrasp also lost his life. A warrior from the army of Arjāsp, named Tūrbarātūr, is said to have entered his temple, and Zoroaster is said to have perished by his sword. Whence the Dastur¹ has drawn this account I am unable to prove, as likewise the assertion of Mr. Malcolm (I. 62, note) that Zoroaster died some years before the

me, preserve the ashes of my (burned) bones, and as long as you do this, the kingdom shall not be taken away from you.' This they did. But he, calling upon Orion, was consumed by celestial fire and died." Thus also Suidas, though he makes Zoroaster an Assyrian.

¹ [Dastur Peshotonji seems to have formed this view on the basis of a series of scattered references in most of the well-known Pahlavi *tomes*, regarding Zoroaster's murder by the most wicked creature ever born of man, *Tūribrādarvakhsh*, to whom the Prophet himself had pointed as his murderer in one of the prophetic declarations so fully recorded in the fifth book of the *Dinkard*, which says:—

નેવાનુસાર રૂપાની અનુભૂતિ કે એવી વિશ્વાસ કરો કે તું આ હું
નેવાનુસાર કરું જોઈ બાં અનુભૂતિ કરું જોઈ નાખું

"As to what constitutes the glorious prophecy and perfect weal of Zartusht, (it is manifest that) his murder by *Tūribrādarvakhsh* was revealed to Zartusht himself."

That this prediction of the Prophet was, no doubt, verified is confirmed, amongst other evidences, by the testimony of the (Pahlavi) *Bahman Yasht*, ch. II. 3, the *Sād-dar*, ch. IX. 5 ("with *Tūribrādarvakhsh* who slew Zaratusht,") and the *Dādastān-i-dīni*, ch. LXXII. 8, "One was *Tūribrādarvakhsh*, the *karap* and heterodox sorcerer, by whom the best of men was killed."—Tr.n.]

above-mentioned invasion. The latter account does not seem to be old; on the contrary, the Sadder Būndehesh, to which we are already indebted for many important statements, asserts that Zoroaster at least did not die in Balkh, but returned to Aryana-vaija after Gushtāsp's conversion.¹ The same book also raises the question why such a distinguished character, as Zoroaster was, should have died at all? We are informed that when Zoroaster asked immortality from God, the latter replied that if Zoroaster were to remain immortal, the wicked Turbarātūr would also remain immortal, the resurrection would then be impossible and mankind without hope. Then Ahura is said to have granted omniscience to Zoroaster for one moment,² when the latter beheld the delights of Paradise and the miseries of Hell, and was satisfied with the dispensations of Providence.

¹ The passage (to which Anquetil draws our attention) occurs in Sadder Būndehesh, fol. 140:—

و اکنون بباید دانستن که آنکه که زراشست اسقنتیان انوشه
روان باد دین در جهان روا بکرد و شاه گشتناسب دین بپذیرفت
و در جهان روا و آشکاره بکرد و دیگر بهشت کشور زعین برسید
ومرد مان بود دین استوار و بیگمان شدند و زراشست انوشیروان باد
برخاست که به ایران ویج شود

² [Compare West, "Pahlavi Texts," part I. p. 194: "In the Vohūman Yasht Commentary (*zand*) it is declared that Zaratusht asked *immortality* from Aūharmazd a second time, and spoke thus:—'I am Zaratusht, more righteous and more efficient among these thy creatures, O Creator! when Thou shalt *make* me immortal as the tree opposed to harm, and Gōpatshāh, Gōshti-Fryān, and Chītrōkmyān, son of Vishtāsp, who is Pēshyōtanū, were made. When Thou shalt make me immortal, they in Thy good religion will believe that the upholder of religion, who receives from Aūharmazd this pure and good religion of the *Mazdayasnān*, will become immortal; then those men will believe in Thy good religion.' Aūharmazd spoke thus:—'When I shall make thee immortal, O Zaratusht the Spitāmān! then Tūribrādarvakhsh the Karap will become immortal, and when Tūribrādarvakhsh the Karap shall become immortal the resurrection and future existence

Now, after we have become acquainted with the circumstances of Zoroaster's life, as they are related, a question forces itself upon us, to which it is necessary, owing to the importance of the man, to find, if not a definite, at least a conditional answer. We mean the question whether Zoroaster was a mythical or a historical character. Nobody is likely to consider the accounts, which we have transcribed, as historical. We could obtain no clear knowledge concerning the interpretation of the name, nor the age, nor even the native country of Zoroaster, and all this indeed least of all from Western narratives, though these are in point of time the more ancient ones. The Oriental reports are, it is true, more in harmony... As the most solid nucleus might, perhaps, remain the statements, that Zoroaster was descended from a royal race, that he had given proofs of his surpassing genius already in his fifteenth year, and that with his thirtieth year he had commenced the promulgation of his religion in the different provinces of Irān, and especially in Arrān and Ādarabaijān, but above all at the court of Gushtāsp in Bactria. Such are the particular items derived from Eastern sources, with which those of Western origin also are not incompatible. Now the question is whether we are to regard all these events as mythical, so that no historical nucleus is to be found in all these narratives; or whether Zoroaster is a historical character, whose life was reduced to a bare tradition by

are not possible.' Zaratusht seemed uneasy about it in his mind; and Aūharmazd, through the wisdom of omniscience, knew what was thought by Zaratusht the Spitāmān with the righteous spirit, and He took hold of Zaratusht's hand. And He, Aūharmazd the Propitious Spirit, Creator of the material world, the Righteous One, even He put the omniscient wisdom, in the shape of water on the hand of Zaratusht, and said to him thus: 'Devour it.' And Zaratusht devoured it; thereby the omniscient wisdom was intermingled with Zaratusht, and seven days and nights Zaratusht was in the Wisdom of Aūharmazd."—*Tr. n.*]

means of legends. Both these views have found their advocates. The mythical view has been lately represented by M. Kern,¹ who, relying especially upon etymology, translates the name Zarathushtra, according to a supposition of M. Windischmann, into "a gold star," and who finds in the names Pourushaspa (many horses, *i. e.*, possessing beams of light) and Maidhyomāo (the middle-moon), a reference to the original sidereal power, and comes to the conclusion that Zoroaster was originally identical with Mithra, but did not signify the morning-star but the evening-star. At all events, the import of Zoroaster must have been utterly forgotten already at the time when the ancients wrote regarding him, and in the age when the Avesta was put together, because there the position of Zoroaster is evidently different. We can follow this view no more than Drs. Justi and Tiele, not because we are opposed in principle to a mythical conception of Zoroaster, but because we do not believe that sufficient proofs are at hand to confirm such a theory. Besides, in accordance with our entire comprehension of the Irānian epic, we would only be able to look upon a *mythus* of Zoroaster as the later-reflected myths, and not as the original ones. For, as we have shown, Zoroaster is indeed most appropriately inserted in the Irānian heroic legend, and even in a comparatively early period, though he does not belong to it originally. We find it, therefore, better, along with most inquirers, to compare Zoroaster rather with the Semitic prophets or with Sakyamuni, than with the Indian Rishis, and to consider the reports of his life as disfigured through their legendary form.

¹ *Vide J. H. C. Kern: Over het woord Zarathushtra en den mythischen Persoon van dien Naam* (*Mededeelingen der K. Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde. Deel XI.*, 1867); and Tiele: *Is Zarathustra een mythisch Persoon*; and F. Justi in *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1867, nr. 51, and my own statement in *Heidelb. Jahrbücher*, 1867, nr. 43.

But now the question will be asked: "What is legend, and what is truth?" We divest the accounts of Zoroaster of all mythical adjuncts; we believe that he was of royal blood; that in his thirtieth year he preached his doctrine in his native country; that the little approbation which they met with at the beginning induced him to emigrate to Bactria; and that he succeeded there in securing adherents by the help of a king Gushtāsp; and we find that in all these statements there lies nothing which is not credible, but unfortunately we cannot also prove that they must have so happened. It is possible that Zoroaster proclaimed his religion in Bactria; but it is also possible that the Bactrian Magi merely asserted for some reason or another the ancient connection of Zoroaster with that city, just in the same manner that the Buddhists cause their Sakyamuni to appear in Ceylon, etc., where he never set foot. In general, if we compare the above-mentioned plain circumstances of Zoroaster's life with those of other like characters, we are inclined to doubt even the latter. Especially in the history of Sakyamuni does there appear to me to exist some similarity. Zoroaster has in common with him royal birth, remarkable supernatural talents displayed in his youth, and lastly the circumstance that he enters upon his vocation of teacher in his thirtieth year. On the other hand, the assumption of his prophetic dignity, and his immediate intercourse with the Deity remind one of Moses and the Semitic laws, that is, in the form in which the narrative has been transmitted to us in Chrysostom. Nay more, some analogy has even been discovered between the 19th chapter of the Vendidād and the history of the temptation by Mathew; even here a Buddhistic parallel may also be found, namely, in the temptations to which Sakyamuni was exposed by Mara, and here Buddhism, indeed, seems to be the borrowing party. We can here, of course, merely allude to such points of contact; but in our opinion they would well deserve a closer study. After all this, the only thing certain

that we can extract from the whole of Zoroaster's biography, is that he really did live. The proof for this assumption lies in the internal evidence, which will be fully discussed later on, that is, in the strict and thoroughly well-considered method which is displayed throughout the whole religion, and which necessarily shows that a single individual at least put his finishing hand to it, whatever may have been his name.

That Zoroaster left behind him some manuscripts is the opinion generally held by the ancients. The opinion of Hermippus on the writings of Zoroaster is well known, and proves the existence of such writings, as are ascribed to him, in the third century before Christ.¹ Even Western authors admit that Zoroaster left behind him his revelations in writing, the original text indeed being named according to Masudi (T. H. 126 ed. P.) Bestā (Avesta), and that, as an aid to its right understanding, he afterwards wrote a commentary under the name Zend, and later on a second commentary under the name Pāzend. After Zoroaster's death the theologians of the Zoroastrian religion wrote a fresh explanation of the earlier commentaries under the name Barida. It is not our purpose to enter here into this subject, which must be more fully discussed further on; only we shall here remark that the Book of Kings also is familiar with this Avesta and Zend and often mentions them. But, though the Book of Kings distinctly teaches us that Zoroaster first taught the Avesta and Zend during the reign of Gushtāsp, and that consequently these books could not have been in existence before, still it commits the inconsistency of supposing their existence in an earlier period. Kaikhosrao especially is very often represented as reciting the Avesta and Zend (Shāh-nāme, p. 964, ll. 11 seq.; (Vul. ed. p. 981); p. 985, ll. 3 seq.) According to one passage (p. 910, l. 5), even Frēdūn depo-

¹ Comp. Windischmann, *Zoroast. Studien*, pp. 288 seq.

sited in Baikend the Avesta written in golden characters. Such inaccuracies seem to me to prove that the artificial arrangement, according to which Zoroaster is placed at the close of the mythical period, had not yet entirely come into vogue.

Now, after we have made the necessary remarks upon the personality of Zoroaster, we may turn to the reign of Gushtāsp, and consequently to the promulgation of the Prophet's religion. Lohrāsp, having entrusted the kingdom to his son before his own death, retired to a fire-temple at Balkh. According to Firdūsi a religious war follows very close upon Gushtāsp's embracing the Zoroastrian Law. The demons are anxious that the intelligence of the great revolution, which has taken place in Irān, should soon reach the ears of Arjāsp, king of Tūrān. The latter at once determines not to tolerate the innovation. He sends an embassy with a letter to Gushtāsp, wherein he admonishes the latter not to listen to the allurements of Zoroaster but to return to the path of justice. Should Gushtāsp comply with his demands he promises to give him rich presents; but should he not take his admonition to heart, he threatens to come with an army in a few months and to desolate Irān. Gushtāsp communicates the message received to his confidential friends, Zarir, Isfandiār, and Jāmāsp, and these undertake to give the proper reply to the king of Tūrān, in which they particularly warn him not to approach Irān with an army, as they themselves intend to march with their forces towards his country. Then preparations are made on both sides and the hostile armies meet near the Oxus. This battle, however, differs materially from earlier ones in the fact that Gushtāsp knew its result beforehand; for he had on his side Jāmāsp, the Wise, who, as we already know, was cognizant of the past as well as of the future, and who then told Gushtāsp that the battle, though it would turn out a very bloody one, would surely end in his favour. What Jāmāsp

had foretold naturally happened. In the single combats which took place, Ardashir, Sheru, and Shēdasp, the three sons of Gushtāsp, fell. Then Kerāmi, the son of Jāmāsp, forced his way into the fight. The imperial banner, which the Irānians had abandoned in the general tumult, was recaptured by Kerāmi, and when the Tūrānians cut off one of his arms he held the banner firmly between his teeth, while he fought with the other arm. But at last he also fell under the blows of overwhelming numbers. Several others among the most valiant Irānians also perished; but in the end Zarir, the commander-in-chief and brother of the king, came on the scene and caused great destruction amongst the Tūrānian heroes. Thus affairs went on for two weeks, and Arjāsp promised a handsome reward to whosoever amongst his heroes would vanquish Zarir; but nobody dared undertake the task. At last Biderefsh undertook it. But even he did not venture to meet Zarir in open combat, and shot him dead with an arrow fired from an ambuscade. The death of Zarir produced great terror in the hearts of the Irānians, and king Gushtāsp, having failed in animating his heroes to avenge the death of Zarir, made a vow that in case he should succeed in his battle with Arjāsp, he would resign his crown to Isfandiār and his army to Peshotan, whilst he himself would retire into solitude after the example of his father Lohrāsp. This vow was naturally a stimulus to Isfandiār to distinguish himself. He threw himself into the thickest of the fight, slew Biderefsh and brought back the arms and the horse of Zarir to the Irānian camp. In a short time no man dared risk a combat with him. Arjāsp finally gave up the battle as lost and fled. The deserted army offered to accept the true Faith and was pardoned by Gushtāsp.

This battle between Gushtāsp and Arjāsp, which we have just narrated, is in its principal features also current in the Avesta. There, too, we find Vishtāspa frequently

praying that he may conquer Arejat-aspā; (Yt. V. 109; IX. 30; XVII. 50; XIX. 87). Arejat-aspā himself also once (Yt. V. 116) appears praying that he may be granted a triumph over Gushtāsp.

Gushtāsp then commissioned Nestūr, the son of Zarir, who had fallen in battle, to invade the kingdom of Arjāsp and to press further his victory, while he himself returned to his country and sent his son Isfandiār all over the world to propagate the Zoroastrian Law. The latter nowhere met with opposition. The Kaiser of Rūm and all princes showed themselves willing to embrace the new religion and requested him to forward the religious books.

Isfandiār was then soon able to inform his father, that the faith of Zoroaster had been accepted throughout the world. Gushtāsp, however, did not appear to remember a word of his former vow to cede his throne voluntarily to Isfandiār after his successful return. On the contrary, circumstances assumed quite a different aspect, and showed the pious Gushtāsp in altogether a peculiar light. Kerzem, a kinsman of the royal house, who hated Isfandiār, calumniated the latter to his father, affirming that he had collected an army to dethrone Gushtāsp. The king readily believed the calumniator and despatched Jāmāsp with a letter ordering Isfandiār to return forthwith to the court. Jāmāsp, as well as Isfandiār himself, knew that evil days awaited the prince if he should answer the summons. Nevertheless, both were of opinion that the commands of his father must be obeyed. They regarded the whole affair as manifestly a trial which had come over the Hero of the Faith, and which the latter had to meet with courage. Gushtāsp, indeed, caused heavy fetters to be laid on Isfandiār on the ground of high treason, and ordered him to be carried to the stronghold of Kenbedan,¹ there to be

¹ According to the author of *Mujmil* the fortress of Kenbedan is identical with Girdkōh, which is supposed to lie in Māzenderān.

bound fast to four iron stakes. How foolish such a proceeding was, Gushtāsp was soon to learn. Some time after this event the king went to Zābul in order to pay a visit to Rustem. The visit lasted very long, fully two years. Meanwhile the news of Isfandiār's imprisonment spread abroad, and the king, who had no need of being afraid any longer of that hero, almost abandoned Zoroaster's religion. Arjāsp also heard this intelligence with delight, as it offered him some prospect of vengeance, for the army, which Isfandiār had placed under the command of his son Behman, had in part disbanded itself, and in part marched to the vicinity of Kenbedan, in order not to be far distant from its beloved commander. As soon as Arjāsp received certain information of these events, and particularly of there being no troops in Balkh,¹ he levied an army, and gave his son Kehrem orders to advance against that city, he himself following soon after with a second army. The project succeeded, and Balkh was taken by surprise, no garrison being found there excepting Lohrāsp and other pious men who adored the sacred fire in retirement. It is true that Lohrāsp immediately took up arms and placed himself at the head of the effective burghers; but, though he sold his life dearly, he was unable to prevent the taking of the town. After his death the fire-temple was invaded and the remaining pious priests were slain. With their blood the sacred fire was extinguished, and both the daughters of Gushtāsp, Humāi and Behāfrīd, were taken into captivity. Still it was fortunate that it occurred to one of the wives of Gushtāsp to steal away from the town in Turkish costume, and to go to Sajistān in order to communicate the

Indeed, Melgunof (*das nördliche Ufer, etc.*, p. 134), mentions a mountain-peak Girdkōh, which lies in the vicinity of the road leading from Astarābād to Shāhrūd.

¹ Here end the portions of the Book of Kings composed by Dakīkī.

important intelligence to Gushtāsp. The latter, thereupon, speedily levied an army; but no sooner had he approached Balkh, than Arjāsp came with a second force to the assistance of Kehrem. It is remarkable enough that Rustom should have let his guest depart, when his position was so desperate, without rendering him any assistance. The battle between Gushtāsp and Arjāsp was a very fierce one, in which many heroes fell on both sides. Thirty-eight sons¹ of Gushtāsp, who took part in the struggle, all perished. Gushtāsp, losing hope, took to flight and was closely pursued by the Tūrānians, who attempted to capture him. Fortunately the flying Irānians came to a steep declivity, the approach to which was only known to Gushtāsp, who led thither his army in safety.² Now the Tūrānians who pursued him, could not find any way up the mountain and were forced to remain content with

¹ The names of these sons seem to be partly mentioned in Yt. XIII. 101. [Zairi-vairi, Yukhta-vairi, Srīraokhshan, Keresaokhshan, Vanāra, Varāza, Būjisravah, Berezyarshti, Tizyarshti, Perethuarshti and Vizyarshti. These names, I suppose, belong to the brothers of Gushtāsp rather than to his sons. Zairi-vairi is identical with the Persian Zarir, the son of Lohrāsp (*Aurvāt-aspa*). *Vide* Yt. V. 112. Among other names West believes *Būjisravah* to be possibly the same with *Pāt-Khosrav*, a brother to Vishtāspa in the *Yadkāri Zarirān*. (Comp. Darmesteter, Yt. XIII. p. 205, n. 5.) *Tr.n.*]

² I have no doubt that this mountain is the same with that mentioned by the Bundehesh, and named *Matō-friyād* ("it came to help"). According to the view of the Bundehesh this mountain appears to have been severed from the extensive range to which it belonged at the time of Gushtāsp's flight, and to have offered a refuge to that religious king. [West reads *Madōfryād* ("come-to-help"), and renders the passage in which this name occurs as follows:—"From the same Padashkhvārgar mountain unto Mount Kūmis, which they call Mount *Madōfriyād*—that in which Vishtāspa routed Arjāsp—is Mount Miyānidasht ('mid-plain'), and was broken off from that mountain there." *Vide* 'Pahlavi Texts,' *Bundehesh*, chapter XII. 32.]

blockading the Irānian army on all sides. In this embarrassed position Gushtāsp was now completely helpless, and turning to Jāmāsp, asked him whether he could find any means of escape. Jāmāsp replied that nobody except Isfandiār was able to deliver him from danger. So Gushtāsp determined to address himself to his heroic son, whom he had so deeply offended, and Jāmāsp was again the bearer of his message. Again did Gushtāsp declare his resolution to renounce the throne and to retire into solitude, in case he were rescued from his present danger, and offer to make Isfandiār his successor. Should the latter refuse, the empire of Irān was undone. Jāmāsp dressed as a Tūrānian stole through the ranks of the enemy and succeeded in reaching Kenbedan, where he communicated to Isfandiār the proposals of Gushtāsp, but found Isfandiār very little disposed to consent. At last, however, the persuasions of Jāmāsp induced him to forget his personal grievances, and to render the desired help to his father. Isfandiār then forced his way through the hostile army, killed many Tūrānians and revived the courage of the Irānians ; whilst Arjāsp on the contrary became despondent, for he had trusted that he would be able to bring the war to an end without the interference of Isfandiār. And, indeed, in the ensuing battle Isfandiār achieved great feats of heroism ; he captured Kergesar alive, who alone ventured to fight with him. Besides, he killed so many Tūrānians, that Arjāsp once again abandoned his army intent only upon safely regaining Tūrān.

APPENDIX.

II.—IRĀNIAN ART.

WHETHER it be entirely due to accidental circumstances or not, it is at least a remarkable fact that all the monuments of Irānian art now in existence belong exclusively to the two Southern dynasties. The cuneiform inscriptions, which have been found in Media, are either foreign to that country, or at least do not belong to the Irānian dynasty of Media. Herodotus relates (I. 98, 99) that Deioces compelled the Medes to build him a fortress. Nevertheless, in the assertion that the seven battlements of this fortress were painted in seven different colours, we may trace the influence of Babylon, where we also find structures having seven storeys, each storey built with bricks of different colours, each colour representing a different planet.¹ Polybius, too (10, 27), mentions a splendid palace in

¹ Cf. Lenormant, *Manuel de l'histoire ancienne de l'Orient*, II. p. 345. Duncker in the latest edition of his *Geschichte des Alterthums* questions this opinion, which, though it cannot be completely proved, is at least highly probable. [Compare also *La Magie chez les Chaldeens*, "Chaldean Magic," Eng. ed. pp. 226-227:—"The worship of the stars was fully developed in the system of Median Magic. Evidently it came into Persia from the Magi. The principal feature of this worship amongst the Medes is made known to us by the description which Herodotus gives of the seven walls of Ekbatana, each with the sacred colour of one of the seven planets. The same sacramental arrangement was observed in the town of Ganzakh, the Ganzaca of the classical

Ekbatana; yet we do not know whether its erection can be ascribed to such a remote period. No traces of the fortress of Deioces, or even of a later palace, can now be found on the site of the ancient Ekbatana. But, though the disappearance of those monuments may be explained by the great antiquity of the Median empire, the same apology cannot be urged in favour of the empire of the Arsacidae. Moreover, it is evident that the kings of that dynasty had no ambition to hand down their glory to posterity, either by the raising of monumental buildings or by engraving inscriptions.

The artistic monuments belonging to the Achaemenidae date from the very founder of their dynasty, Cyrus, the remains of whose edifices lie in the plains of Murghāb.¹ We cannot believe the assumption that the plains of Murghāb were identical with the ancient Pasargadæ;² however, this does not imply that Cyrus could never have

writers, and in Ātropātene, since Moses Chorenensis calls it 'the second Ekbatana, the town with seven walls.' Later, in the period of the Sassanian dynasty, the Persian poet Nizāmi describes this style as prevailing in the 'Palace of the Seven Planets' built by Behrām-Gour or Verahrān V. (A.D. 420)." The famous Babylonian tower of Borsippa is said to have had seven storeys with the colours representing the seven planetary bodies.—*Tr.n.*]

¹ [Vide Spiegel, *Erānische Alterthumskunde*, vol. I. p. 95. An extensive valley near the upper banks of the Pulvār is called the Murghāb valley.]

² [Vide Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 487 :—“The hill unquestionably commands the entrance to the valley, or rather plain of Murgāb, now admitted to be that of Pasargadæ; but the strong natural barriers, which the mountains present to the south and to the north, render additional walls unnecessary. Nevertheless, Pliny (VI. 26), calls this spot the Castle of Pasargadæ, occupied by the Magi, and wherein is the tomb of Cyrus.”—“*Inde ad orientem Magi obtinent Passagardas castellum, in quo Cyri sepulcrum est.*” The city of Pasargadæ may, therefore, rather be considered a holy city, consecrated to the Colleges of the Magi,

built in that region. Several edifices, indeed, seem to have once existed there;¹ but they have been so utterly demolished, that no plan of them can now be made out. A platform is still visible, leaning towards the hill which commands the plains of Murghāb. It is 264 feet high and has a frontage of more than 200 feet; but the buildings, which formerly stood on this platform, have long since disappeared. In another part of the plain there is a second platform, on which five pillars, the remains of a smaller palace, are still erect. On one of these pillars there is the image of a man wearing a peculiar head-dress, such as is observed also on Egyptian monuments, and with wings apparently issuing from the shoulders. A short inscription over the image states that it represents *Kurus*, the king of the Achaemenidae. Certain peculiarities in the inscription seem to prove that it is older than the other cuneiform writings, and that it may even date from Cyrus² the Great. This supposition is borne out by the wings, which, as we already know, are symbols of kingly majesty.³

and the officers of religion, than as a stationary royal residence. And nothing can be more probable, since it was built by Cyrus to commemorate the great victories which made him king, than that he should consecrate it to the gods. Cyrus, according to Xenophon, made seven visits into Persia Proper, his original kingdom, after his accession to the vast empire to which he gave its name; and although that historian does not specify the particular place in his paternal land, whither he went to perform his accustomed religious duties; yet, as he was the founder of Pasargadæ, avowedly as a memorial of his national achievements, what can we more naturally suppose, than that Pasargadæ would be the scene of such rites?"—*Tr.n.*]

¹ Comp. Ker Porter, "Travels," (London, 1821), vol. I. pp. 485 seq. Ménant, *Les Achéménides*, p. 17.

² Cf. Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften*, pp. 75, 145.

³ [Comp. *ibid.* vol. III. p. 599:—"Herodotus relates that when Cyrus had a mind to attack the Massagetae, he fancied in his dream that he saw two wings growing from the shoulders of

The head-dress is supposed to represent splendour and glory. But, since Cyrus in his inscription calls himself simply "king," it seems that that image must have been carved even before he had assumed the title of "Great King." A third edifice, which is in a state of complete preservation and belongs to the time of the Achaemēnidae, is now popularly known as the sepulchre of the mother of Suliemān. It is really a tomb, though not that of Cyrus, but probably of a woman.¹ A wide area surrounds this tomb,² which may be recognized from its outward appearance by the remains of 24 round columns forming a quadrangle having six columns on each face.³ The base, on which the sepulchre rests, is composed of huge blocks of beautiful white marble, rising in a series of steps. At the foot of these steps the base measures 40 feet in one direction and 44 in the other. The lowest step is 5 feet 6 inches high, the second begins 2 feet from the edge of the first, and measures 3 feet and 6 inches in height, the third is 3 feet 4 inches high, the fourth 1 foot 11

Darius, and that one of these over-shadowed Asia, the other Europe; this may only be a symbol of royal dignity, and in fact we find in Murghāb, Cyrus himself represented with wings and with a head-dress which can only be supposed to be a halo emblematic of royalty. This is found only in the case of members of the royal family, who are distinguished also by other symbols from the generality of mankind. For instance, the descendants of Kai-qobād have black moles on their arms, and the Seleucidæ spread the belief that they were born with a mark on their hips in the shape of a buoy."—*Tr.n.*]

¹ [Cf. *E. A.* vol. II. p. 621. Oppert believes that the modern Murghāb may be identical with the *Μαρπάσιον* mentioned by Ptolemy, (VI. 4); nevertheless he supposes that the sepulchre may be that of a woman, possibly of Kassandane referred to by Herodotus in II. 1.]

² Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 499.

³ [To have six columns on each side, four must be placed within the quadrangle.—*Tr.n.*]

inches, the fifth 1 foot 10 inches, and the sixth is of the same height as the fifth. On the top rises the sepulchre, which opens on the north-western side, and is 4 feet in height. Its interior contains only one empty chamber. It is probable that this edifice is modelled after the Babylonian temples, though on a reduced scale and executed in stone.¹ According to Sir Henry Rawlinson's assertion, the work of excavation in the plains of Murghāb ought to prove useful, and we may expect from it interesting results in the future.

From Murghāb a march of only a few leagues brings us to the magnificent valley, in which was the old residence of the Achaemenidae. The plain is called Hafrek, or more commonly, though erroneously, Merdasht, which only denotes the tract extending from the ruins of Istakhr, on the left bank of the Palvār, to the junction of this river with the Kum Firūz. We know from ancient chronicles how the royal palace of Persia was destroyed by a Greek courtesan, who in the course of a drunken orgy threw a burning torch into the edifice. Nevertheless, some portions of it have been preserved to this day. The plain of Hafrek also contains a few more ruins of the same age. The present population of Irān, having long since lost all remembrance of the Achaemenidae, give to these ruins entirely false names, and generally associate them with the heroes of old legendary history. The most important are known by the name of the Forty Columns (*Chihil-setūn* or *Chihil-minār*).² A description of the palace, as it existed

¹ Ferguson, "History of Architecture," vol. I. p. 156.

² ["These ruins, for which the name *Chihil Menāre* or the 'forty minarets,' can be traced back to the 13th century, are now known as Takhti Jamshīd, 'the throne of Jamshīd.' That they represent the Persepolis captured and partly destroyed by Alexander the Great, has been beyond dispute at least since the time of Pietro della Valle. Amongst the earlier scholars the fanciful notions of

before its destruction, has been transmitted to us by Diodorus, (17, 71).¹ According to his statement, the castle had three walls, of which the first was 16 ells high and provided with a parapet; the second wall had double this height; the third, which formed a quadrangle 60 ells in height, was built of immense blocks of stone; on each side were brazen doors and also railings 20 ells high. The interior of the castle contained chambers for the king and his chief officers, and the treasury. This account seems to be quite borne out by the remains of the castle existing at the present day. The first two walls mentioned by Diodorus have disappeared; but the inner quadrangle containing the castle proper still remains. This castle stood on a cliff, the sides of which had been made perpendicular by art, partly by scarping the black marble rock, and partly by erecting a massive wall against its sides. The terrace thus formed had its front towards the west, the right side towards the north, the left towards the south, while the back or the eastern side was connected with the higher mountain behind. The

the Persians, who are utterly ignorant of the real history of their country before Alexander, often received too much attention; hence many of them were of opinion that the buildings were of much higher antiquity than the time of Cyrus; and even those who rightly regarded them as the works of the Achaemenians, were unable to support their theory by conclusive evidence. The decipherment of the cuneiform Persian inscriptions found on the ruins and in the neighbourhood has put an end to all doubt on this point. We now read with absolute certainty that some of the edifices are the work of Darius I., Xerxes, Artaxerxes III. (Ochus), and with equal certainty we may conclude that all the others were built under the Achaemenian dynasty." *Vide "Encyclopædia Britannica."* — *Tr.n.]*

¹ Besides the works of Niebuhr and Ker Porter, for this description I have also referred to Lassen's article on Persepolis in *Der Ersch und Gruberschen Encyclopädie*, Menant's *Les Achéménides*, (Paris 1872), and Fergusson's "History of Architecture."

height of this terrace is about 11 yards, its length from north to south about 520 yards, and its breadth from east to west 315 yards.¹ Its shape may be described as almost quadrangular, though with many corners or angles and small projections. The surface is not quite level, but divides itself into three platforms of different heights. The ascent is on the western side, though not in the middle, but nearer the north. A splendid double flight of stairs leads up to the terrace. It is about 23 feet broad, and formed of blocks of marble so immense that ten steps and about a seventh part of the eleventh are cut in a single block, while each of these steps is scarcely 4 inches high, so that one can easily ride up on horseback. Each of the two staircases has a resting-place in the middle. On the southern side, also, a smaller and steeper staircase leads up to the platform, and probably a similar one, as I conjecture, existed on the northern side. As soon as you ascend the platform, you stand before two pillars from which stand out two gigantic bulls (about 18 feet high and $19\frac{1}{2}$ feet long). They stand on pedestals of about 5 feet in height and form the remains of a doorway only $12\frac{3}{5}$ feet in breadth. This doorway leads into a small apartment, which had, even in M. Chardin's time, four splendid columns. At present only two are erect ($54\frac{7}{10}$ feet high). They are evidently relics of a portico, which led to two other pillars with corresponding figures. In the latter the bulls are represented with human faces wearing tiaras. We now learn that the figures of these fabulous beasts are imitations of the Assyrian style of architecture.² An

¹ Comp. Menant, *Les Achéménides*, p. 39. According to Ker Porter (I. p. 582), the terrace has a length of 802 feet towards the south, 926 feet towards the north, and 1,425 feet towards the west.

² Cf. Ménant, *ibid*, p. 40. He surmises that the faces of these beasts were likenesses, and that it is not difficult to recognize in their features the monarchs whom the artist intended to represent.

Inscription at the entry (D, as it is generally named), informs us that this door was built by Xerxes and intended to be the ordinary entrance. This accounts for the large double staircase, which served for the accommodation of deputations consisting of great numbers of people. The only trace yet existing on the smooth-worn part of the terrace, besides this entrance, is a conspicuous cistern, probably a relic of an ancient aqueduct. This part of the structure may also have contained the quarters of the guards and other servants of the castle. If you turn from this doorway to the right hand (*i.e.*, to the south), you come to a second splendid staircase, through which you ascend, by 31 steps, to the second part of the terrace, which is higher by $6\frac{1}{3}$ feet. There are altogether four staircases; a double staircase in the middle, and single staircases rising on the eastern and western sides. The projecting wall of the middle staircase is covered with sculptures divided by three tablets intended for inscriptions.¹ Two of these tablets are blank, and the Old Persian text (A) alone has been engraved on the third. It dates from Xerxes I. On both sides of the inscriptions stand figures, three on the right with spears and shields, four on the left with spears only. The number seven I do not consider to be merely accidental. Each of the figures wears a high tiara and the Median costume, while the beard and hair are carefully curled. Probably they represent body-guards and chamberlains, who watched the entrance to the royal apartments. The two angular spaces on each side of these figures are filled with effigies of a lion attacking a fabulous beast. The rear wall also of that part of the platform, from which the staircase projects, extends from east to west, side by side with the ascending steps, and is covered with engraved figures of persons apparently ascending. Originally there were three rows of such figures, but the

¹ Cf. Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 594 and tablet 34.

topmost row has been half destroyed, which circumstance proves that the wall must have been formerly higher. The length of each row is 68 feet. Towards the east the lowest row includes 53 persons standing,¹ of whom 32 are men, partly in close-fitting and partly in wide garments. The latter seems to be the Persian, the former the Median costume. The head is apparently covered by a flat cap; hair and beard are dressed with the customary care. Some of the figures carry bows, others short swords; others again are without any weapons, but adorned with necklaces, ear-rings, and bracelets, all royal insignia, perhaps indicative of their rank. Several of them carry a staff with a ball. These are, as Sir R. Ker Porter correctly supposes, the so-called *Melophores*. Before these 32 figures march 21 armed men, probably a portion of the body-guard. The second row shows again 32 persons of the same description, preceded by 21 spearmen. The figures in the third row cannot now be made out. I am inclined to believe that these personages are partly the great men of the Empire, who had the special privilege of ascending in the presence of the king by the chief staircase. Still more interesting are the carvings on the western side of the wall.² Here also there are three rows, one above the other. The highest row is again damaged. The figures are arranged in divisions of six persons each, the divisions being separated from one another by a border of cypress leaves. The first figure in each wears a wide, flowing robe, a tiara, dagger, and girdle, and bears a long staff. M. Lassen is perfectly right in surmising these to be the so-called *σκηπτοῦχοι* of Xenophon, (*Cyropaedia*, 8, 3, 15 and 22), royal chamberlains, who had to conduct the deputations into the presence of the king. Their distinctive attire seems to indicate their

¹ Niebuhr, tablet 21. Ker Porter, tablet 37.

² Niebuhr, tablet 22. Ker Porter, tablets, 37-43.

rank. As to the persons ushered in by them, every division has its peculiar costume.¹ The second figure in each wears no clothing, but the others are distinguished by divers articles of dress which they wear or carry, or by their cattle, horses, and chariots. Spearmen do not seem to march before them, but they are carved above the steps of the staircase, one over each step. It has long been the unanimous opinion of antiquarians that these persons represent delegates who bring tribute from the provinces. Whether this was on some peculiar occasion, such as New Year's Day, the birthday of the king, or the like, cannot be ascertained. On the eastern and western extremities of this wall is also represented the lion attacking a fabulous beast.

After mounting upstairs, you come to a perron in a great portico, which is the chief attraction of the ruins of Persepolis and has given rise to the name of *Chihil-minār* or "Forty Columns." The centre of this portico was formed by a quadrangle of 36 columns, in 6 rows; three other groups of twelve columns, each in two rows, stand on the north, east, and west sides of this quadrangle, forming a vestibule and two side wings to the great hall. On the south side there is no such group. So there were, on the whole, 72 columns, the positions of which may still be recognized, but of which only thirteen are now erect. The columns are all of black marble, each having 32 flutes or channels. The height of each is 64 feet, that of the capital being 4·6 feet. The bases of the columns of the central hall differ from those of the apartments standing close to it. The floor of this part of the palace consisted of large marble slabs. M. Lassen is probably right in supposing that this great hall must have been a vestibule,

* According to Ménant (p. 49), 15 to 16 descriptions of persons may be enumerated, who are distinguished by the articles of dress, &c., which they seem to be offering as tribute.

not a presence-chamber, as was formerly believed. Its splendour was intended only to increase the awe of those who were to be admitted to an interview. This portico occupies two-thirds of the second platform, whereof it forms the principal edifice. Continuing towards the south you come to a third terrace requiring a further ascent of ten feet. The building upon it had two façades, one to the north, the other to the west, the principal staircase leading up on the western side. The walls surrounding the base of this terrace were also decorated with sculptures and contained an inscription of Xerxes in three languages (Ca), recording that the edifice (G. in Niebuhr) had been erected by Darius I.; nevertheless we believe that it was finished by Xerxes I. This inscription is again repeated on a column at the top of the staircase. This edifice is, likewise, in ruins; but isolated walls with windows, doors, and door-posts are still erect, since they were made of blocks too huge to be easily removed by modern Persians. It is 170 feet long and 95 feet broad, and contains three apartments; a great hall in the middle and two apartments attached to it by doors on the north and south sides. Excavations have shown that its roof was supported by 16 columns, there being in the northern vestibule 8 columns in two rows. The effigies carved in this edifice are of great interest. The northern and southern walls of the great hall exhibit again the image of the king, over whom hovers the image of Ahura Mazda.¹ On the eastern and western walls of the same hall we find a human figure—no doubt the king—fighting against various monsters; the same sculpture also represents a hero who has seized a lion and is thrusting a dagger into the heart of the animal.

Over several of the portals we find the image of the king, walking, habited in a long robe, with wide sleeves,

¹ [This image, I believe, represents only the *Fravashi* or the guardian spirit of the personage over whom it hovers.—*Tr.n.*]

its flowing skirts reaching to the ankles, high shoes, a sceptre in one hand, and a cup or a flower in the other. Two servants, much shorter than the king himself, hold above him an umbrella and a fly-flap. A short inscription (B), over the image in three languages, informs us that the king represented there is Darius I. On the straight cap as well as on the breast, hands, and shoulders, are holes in which, probably, ornaments of gold or precious stones were once fastened. The same image is also exhibited over a second portal. But here the king holds in the left hand a drinking vessel, in the right one a kettle. Near the side-doors to the south and west there are figures of spearmen, and round the windows runs a short inscription (L), which is repeated eighteen times in this part of the palace, having the Persian text on top, the Scythian on the left, and the Assyrian on the right. It must also be mentioned that on the western staircase there is an inscription of Artaxerxes III., which may be clearly accounted for from the changes which that king must have made in the palace of Darius. It is generally agreed that the building contained apartments, intended to be used by the king for ordinary purposes. This is also suggested by the bas-reliefs executed on the walls of its staircase, which again represent persons bearing other gifts than those already named above—a lamb, a melon, &c., in short, whatever is requisite for domestic use.

On one side of this edifice, about 82 yards towards the west, there are some indistinct traces of another structure, that seems to have stood quite on the top of the terrace. Herein the inscription (P) of Artaxerxes III. is repeated. We also observe some vestiges of another inscription in Assyrian cuneiform characters, which dates from Artaxerxes I. Perhaps that king had laid the foundation of the structure, which was afterwards finished by Artaxerxes III. Here bas-reliefs are in a good state of preservation. There are figures of persons bearing tribute

including ivory which must probably have come from Egypt.¹

On the third terrace there are again some other considerable, though now very ruinous, edifices, to which stairs lead up. A great staircase may have formerly existed here, but no traces thereof are now to be seen. Along the walls of the staircase there are sculptured figures resembling those of the second platform. Above hovers the symbol of Ahura Mazda which, however, is not now quite distinct, and an inscription of Xerxes (Ea), which is elsewhere repeated (Eb). Of the two buildings in this part of the terrace, one (H) has been so completely destroyed, that little can be said about it. A second edifice (I) connected with the former by a sculptured passage is very similar to the structure (G) described above. It consists of a hall, close to which stands on the north side an apartment equal to it in length. This hall contains as many as 36 columns, and had on two sides similar apartments, each one having three partitions. Here, too, you will see sculptured figures. Here, also, the king is represented walking, followed by two attendants holding above him the fly-flap and the umbrella. The inscription over the head of the king (C) records that he is Xerxes I.; his name is also engraved in several places on his robe. Xerxes seems to have been taller than his father; both these figures deserve a still more accurate study. That these buildings were used for domestic purposes, is quite evident from their sculpture. With these two edifices ends the palace towards this side. On the southern wall of this platform there are four inscriptions, which may be read from the plain below, and which deviate from the common arrangement. Two of these contain Persian texts, viz., the two important inscriptions (H) and (I). The other tablets contain each a Scythian and an Assyrian

¹ Comp. Herodotus III. 97, and Ménant, p. 64.

text, not mere translations of the Persian text, as is commonly the case, but each of them an independent inscription. The Scythian one states that Darius erected the palace, and that no one had ever built there before.¹ We admit, therefore, the certainty that Darius himself had raised the palace of Persepolis, which was afterwards completed by his successors. The Assyrian text is independent too, but adds nothing new to our knowledge.

Having surveyed all the portions of the palace of Persepolis, which lie on the western side of the platform, we return to the gate of entrance to take a view of the remaining ones, which lie in a natural depression of the terrace towards the eastern side, and may, therefore, be reached without any staircase. On turning away from the main entry to the east, we soon reach the remains of the portico (O), evidently leading from the principal gate to an edifice (L), which must have been the largest of all the buildings in Persepolis, for it measures 300 feet from north to south, and $247\frac{1}{2}$ feet from west to east. Formerly, this portico seems to have been a vestibule consisting of 16 columns. At the entrance there once stood two colossal beasts, the pedestals of which are still remaining, like those at the main gateway. The structure itself consisted of one large and single hall, the ceiling of which seems to have been supported by 100 columns in ten rows. It contains no inscriptions; only the front and southern walls are richly adorned with sculpture. Near the door the king is represented,² sitting on a throne, with his feet resting on a footstool, while behind him stands a eunuch with the fly-flap in his right hand, and a piece of cloth in the left. Behind him stands an armour-bearer with sword and bow, and another holding a spear. Before the footstool are deposited vessels for burning incense, behind which stands a person with

¹ Ménant, pp. 80-81.

² Cf. Niebuhr, tablet 29. Ker Porter, tablet 45, b.

his hand held up to his mouth, probably an envoy who has been admitted into the royal presence. Beneath the throne stand forty guards in four rows, their faces looking inwards toward the central throne. Above the king hovers a figure, which, no doubt, represents Ahura Mazda. On the right and left sides of this symbol are three animals; but it is not determined whether they are intended to represent dogs, bulls, or lions. All these rows are divided by borders studded with roses. A similar likeness of the king is found at the southern door lying opposite.¹ The throne is not surrounded by body-guards, but there are fourteen men of various nationalities, who seem to support it. Behind the king is only an eunuch with a fly-flap, but no figure stands before him. Since the king is represented twice at each door, this image appears four times on each wall. At the doors of the eastern and western walls are again effigies of combats with fabulous beasts. That we have in this edifice the real presence-hall of Darius is unquestioned, and M. Niebuhr² has ingeniously remarked that it is not without some purpose that we here find Darius always represented in a sitting attitude, not walking as in the structure (G). Sideways from this edifice (L), nearer to (G), there is an immense pile of ruins. Among these ruins, which form the remains of a considerable building, are seen 5 stones $21\frac{1}{2}$ feet in height, covered with sculpture. They form the door-posts and part of the side-walls of a dilapidated building, which M. Lassen believes to be the hall of judgment. On each side of the entrance is the figure of the king, walking with two attendants; on the walls, however, he is represented sitting in state on his throne, which is borne by divers persons. Behind the king stands a dignitary dressed nearly like him. Finally, the last building towards the south on this platform

¹ Niebuhr, tablet 30.

² Cf. Niebuhr, "Travels," p. 148.

(K), contains a hall similar to the one described above. Though without side-chambers, still it has another hall in front. No inscription informs us of its use; but on the walls we observe the king represented at one time as walking, and at another seated with his companions, and again we see the combats with fabulous beasts. Nothing can be stated as to the purposes of this building, and the hypothesis of Sir R. Ker Porter, that the sacred fire was here preserved, cannot be supported by any evidence.

These are the structures which constituted the great palace of Persepolis. We must add that the whole was liberally supplied with aqueducts, regarding which more accurate evidence is, nevertheless, wanting. That part of the castle which lay to the western side of the platform, and which was accessible by means of staircases, was probably occupied by the king and his family; whilst those buildings which were situated lower down, and faced the east, must have been intended for public occasions. Guests were probably not admitted within the castle; suitable buildings for their accommodation in the neighbourhood were certainly not wanting at the time when the Persian kings kept court at Persepolis.

The remaining relics of Persepolis consist of three *dakhmas*, which are hewn in the side of the mountain towards which leans the terrace on which the castle stood. The first of these sepulchres lies to the east of the palace (L), the second only 400 paces further southward, the third a quarter of a league more to the south; but the last was never finished. These sepulchres are cut half-way up the mountain-wall, about 300 feet above the level of the plain. Here the wall was cut smooth for the purpose. The facade had four pilasters projecting 8 inches from the wall. On both sides of these columns stand 6 spearmen in three tiers one above another. Between the two middle columns is a door cut three inches deep. It was, indeed, an apparent door, since there was no real entrance.

through it. The shafts of the columns are crowned with the heads of double-bulls. Between these heads is the quadrangular head of a beam hewn in stone. On the columns rests an entablature, on which are represented the figures of 18 dogs or lions, 9 on each side, running in opposite directions, but separated in the middle by a lotus-flower. In the middle of this entablature a figure is seen raising one hand and holding a bow in the other. It is, no doubt, another likeness of a king. He stands before a fire-altar, over him soars the God Ahura Mazda. The other sepulchres have quite similar decorations, with some differences of detail too unimportant to be noticed. None of them was intended to be opened from the front; and we do not know in what way dead bodies were brought in. These *dakhmas* have now all been opened, though forcibly and in recent times; they are found to contain catafalques intended for the reception of biers. These catafalques are partly still in existence, and the marble, of which they are made, seems to have been brought there from distant places, since it is different from the mountain rock itself.

That none of these *dakhmas* in the so-called "Mountain of Sepulchres" near Persepolis belonged to the founder of the castle, the first Darius, might be inferred from an account of Ctesias, who states (*Pers.* 18), that Darius I. had, in his life-time, his *dakhma* constructed *in the double mountain* (*ἐν τῷ διπλῷ ὄρει*); he wished to visit it himself, but was restrained from doing so by the Chaldeans and his parents. His parents, however, actually visited the *dakhma*, but fell down and died, because the priests who drew them up to it, at the sight of some serpents, let go the ropes from terror. Now, this *dakhma* of Darius has actually been found. It is situated about a league north of the village which stands on the site of the ancient Istakhr.¹ There we see, over against the rising

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. pp. 516 seq. Niebuhr, II. pp.-155 seq.

sun, a rock of white marble, about 200 paces in length, called Naqsh-i-Rustem by the natives; and in it we find four *dakhmas* at nearly equal heights of from 60 to 70 feet above the level of the plain. They are of similar architecture. The only inscription to be found belongs to the third, which we shall describe somewhat in detail instead of all the others. The base, the entrance, and the *dakhma* above it, give to the whole monument the form of a cross. The entrance does not differ from that of the sepulchres of Persepolis. Here also we see columns with heads of double-bulls, and between the two central columns is the shape of a door,¹ but the real opening, which is below, is a quadrangular aperture of 4 feet 6 inches in length. Above the frieze is the representation of a catafalque in two tiers borne by two rows of persons (14 in each row). On the top of the catafalque stands the king with his right hand raised and a bow in his left. He stands before the fire-altar; between him and the fire appears Ahura Mazda hovering above, and a ball which is certainly meant to represent the Sun or Mithra. In the frame which surrounds this catafalque, stand six persons on each side of the king—on the right side men armed with spears, apparently body-guards, on the left persons who are supposed to represent mourners. Above some of the latter are short inscriptions indicating who they are. At the left of the king stands *Gaubaruva* (Gobryas), the lance-bearer of the king; below him *Aspaçanâ*,² his arrow or bridle-keeper. Above one of the bearers of the royal throne is cut a name which may be *Macya*.³ Side by side with this image are inscriptions in three different languages.⁴ The first of these inscriptions

¹ Ker Porter, plate 17.

² [Aspithanes, the quiver-bearer of Darius I.]

³ [Probably the Matienans mentioned by Herodotus, VII. 72].

⁴ Since the statements of different writers contradict one another, we cannot venture to determine its position. Comp. Rawlinson, "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," vol. X. p. 289, note.

consists of 60 lines (commonly known as N.R. a); it is the real epitaph of Darius I., and consequently of later date than the other inscriptions; the second, which is beneath the other (N.R. b), has been so mutilated by the fanaticism of the Mohammedans, that, except the beginning, it is no longer possible to decipher its contents.

Not far from Naqsh-i-Rustem, near the village Hâjiâbâd, are the ruins of a considerable edifice of the time of the Achaemenidae, but which has suffered too much injury to be now accurately traced. A column of great beauty is still standing; similar ones lie broken and scattered about. They are popularly known as the throne of Jamshid.¹ Two buildings seem to have occupied the site. Still nearer to Naqsh-i-Rustem, and only about 35 paces distant from the first sepulchre, stands to this day a mysterious edifice resembling a tower, likewise belonging to the Achaemenidae.² It was built in the form of a square, with edges projecting like pilasters, each side 22 feet 8 inches long and now about 35 feet high. The marble-blocks laid one above the other, each 3½ feet in height, formed ten (according to others fifteen) layers. The length of each marble-block is very great, so that there are never more than two of them, though varying in length, making up the entire length of each side of the tower. The architrave consists of a single colossal marble-block 22 feet 8 inches long, prettily decorated with small beam-like extremities and quadrangular niches. The tower is walled in on all sides and has only towards the north a door 6 feet high, and 5 feet wide, surrounded by plainly decorated marble pillars. In the interior there is only one quadrilateral chamber with four sides, 12 feet by 12, and 15 to 16 feet high. What purpose it served cannot now be made out. Finally, we ascribe also to the period of

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. pp. 514 seq.

² Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 562.

the Achaemenidae the two fire-altars standing near one another,¹ in the neighbourhood of the Naqsh-i-Rustem bas-reliefs, where the rock first turns towards the north, and then forms an amphitheatre extending towards the west. They stand on the same platform, are made of huge rocks, and have a height of from 12 to 14 feet.

As to the monuments of the Achaemenidae outside Persepolis, we need but mention them briefly, since they have not, as specimens of art, the same importance as the mighty castle of Persepolis. The monument of Behistān, celebrated for its inscription, stands likewise on a rock, which rises nearly perpendicular from the plain to a height of 1,700 feet. Besides the inscriptions, there are also seen on this rock sculptures at such a height as to have been quite secure from mutilation by the Mohammedans, while they are perfectly visible from the plain. The Persian text of the inscription contains 416 lines (four columns containing 95 lines each and the fifth only 36). There are also Scythian and Assyrian translations, which render the text accurately on the whole, with slight characteristic additions here and there. In the middle of these inscriptions stands a bas-relief representing a scene in which king Darius is the conspicuous figure, which can easily be recognized. He wears the crown on his head, has his right hand raised and his left holding a bow. Behind him stand two dignitaries, of whom the one carries a bow, and the other a lance. The king is setting his foot on a prisoner lying on the ground. Before him stand nine persons with their hands tied behind them and all bound together by means of a rope. Short inscriptions inform us who is the person represented in each case. Above the whole scene hovers Ahura Mazda in the form in which he is commonly symbolized. Of the meaning of the whole scene we are sufficiently informed by the longer inscription. The captives are rebels,

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 566.

who were defeated and executed by Darius I., against whom they had revolted. No edifice in the neighbourhood of the inscription gives us any clue to the reason why Darius was induced to set just here the chief of his inscriptions; moreover, the beauty of its environment has attracted all spectators, and Ctesias describes the mountain (Comp. Diodorus, 2, 13) under the name of *Bagistānon*,¹ and erroneously ascribes the monuments on it to Semiramis. But the mountain was, he says, sacred to Zeus. The locality is well adapted to the planting of a park. It is, therefore, not improbable that Darius had here a park and a villa, where he resided when he sojourned in Media. Perhaps the memory of the defeat of the Median rebel Fravartis, which may have taken place not far from here, induced the king to immortalize his deeds on the very spot. There is yet a second monument of the Achaemenidae in Media, on Mount Alvend. It belongs both to Darius I. and his son Xerxes. Since the later kings are said to have dwelt on Mount Alvend, it might perhaps be supposed that their predecessors did so likewise; but such a hypothesis is not supported by the site of the inscription itself, for the way to the inscription-tablets leads from Hamadān through a mountain defile now called Abbāsābād. It is watered by a mountain-torrent and well cultivated at first, but it soon grows wild and lonely, until you come at last to a waterfall which dashes down a rocky wall of red marble. On the southern side of this marble-wall there are two niches, and in them the two inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes, generally known as (O) and (F). Of an inscription, which Darius caused to be cut on his Egyptian canal we have spoken already before.² It is composed in four languages

¹ *Bagistānon*, i. e. the resort of the Deity, is the original form of the modern name Behistān, of which the form Behistun, often used, is a mere corruption, occurring as early as in Yāqūt.

² [Vide Spiegel, E.A. vol. III. p. 665: "Nor is the completion of the Egyptian Canal, the construction of which was begun

and there are several repetitions, but unfortunately it is not in a good state of preservation.

Nor is the last monument of the two Achaemenian kings so often named, which is found in the remote north, near the town of Van in Armenia, without interest. It proves that Darius I. as well as Xerxes I. must have resided there. An inscription of Xerxes in three languages (K) stands on a steep rocky wall, which rises directly from the plain near Van, and which is now crowned by a Turkish fortress. The inscription is engraved where the rock is steepest, about 60 feet above the ground, but the characters are so beautiful and distinct that they can be read without difficulty from the plain. The inscription tells us that Darius I. here erected several magnificent palaces (*stāna*), and had also fixed upon a place for an inscription, which he had not caused to be executed during his life-time. It was only Xerxes, who, after his accession to the throne, ordered an inscription to be engraved there.

Since it was probably Darius I., who transferred the residence of the Achaemenidae from Persepolis to Susa, we should expect to find monuments of his activity principally in the latter town. But here the ravages of time have spared none of his buildings, nor any of those which preceded the Persian conquest; for we know that the Susa here mentioned, must be the very ancient town which had, already before the foundation of the Persian empire, sustained many a siege under the Assyrian kings. The place where it once stood, has been discovered by the English traveller, Mr. Loftus.¹ According to him, it lay between

by Ramses II., continued by Necho, but finished as far as the Red Sea by Darius, of less importance. Near this canal there are several sculptured monuments with hieroglyphic and cuneiform characters, amongst which stands an inscription of Darius in Old Persian." *Tr. n.*]

¹ Comp. Loftus' "Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana," pp. 342 seq.

the Kerkha and the Dizful, in a level country where the distance between these two rivers diminishes to two English miles and a half. The ruins of this town lie about three-fourths of an English mile distant from the Kerkha, and about one mile and a half from the Dizful. During the period of its prosperity artificial canals must have supplied the necessary water, at the same time adding to its military strength. The dilapidated structures on the hills of Susa can by no means be compared with the grandeur of the ruins of Persepolis. Nevertheless Mr. Loftus has succeeded in finding among its remains the ruins of a palace, totally destroyed, which had some resemblance to the palace of Persepolis, like which it also stood on a high terrace. Traces of its columns are still seen rising on a façade of 330 feet in length, the breadth of the building being 264 feet. In the middle there is a group of 36 columns in six rows, evidently the remains of a pillared hall of the kind common in Persepolis. Here also the bases of the columns are not everywhere similar; those of the principal hall are quadrangular, the others round, while the capitals were, it seems, of the same description as in Persepolis, but more elaborate and more like their models in wood. Four columns of the principal hall bore the Persepolis inscriptions in three languages; whereof the Persian text faced the south, the Scythian the west, the Assyrian the east. Although they have been much injured, yet antiquarians have succeeded in deciphering easily the Persian text (S). These inscriptions were engraved by order of Artaxerxes II. and record that the edifice (*apadana*) was founded by Darius I., continued by Artaxerxes I., and finished by Artaxerxes II. Close to it there seems to have been erected a temple dedicated to Anāhita, as we find in several parts of the ruins a number of images of that *yazata* in *terra cotta*.

Besides architectural monuments, whatever antiquities we possess of the age of the Achaemenidae, are limited to

some vases and seals bearing inscriptions in cuneiform characters. One of the seals probably belonged to Darius I. The vases come from Egypt and bear the name of Xerxes in four languages (Egyptian, Persian, Scythian, and Assyrian).

We shall conclude our examination of the works of art belonging to this epoch with some general observations. Notwithstanding the long time that has elapsed since the destruction of these old palaces, their outlines have still been preserved. This is owing to the fact that the Achaemenian princes employed, in their architecture, particularly stone, and not wood or brick, as was generally the custom in Assyria and Babylon. A peculiarity of these palaces consists in their splendid staircases leading from one storey to another. It is remarkable that the Persians are the only people of antiquity, who knew how to make architectural use of staircases. Moreover, it might be regarded as a defect in these structures that the floor is quite superfluously overloaded with columns, and further that the capitals of these columns followed too strictly their wooden originals.¹ Among the bas-reliefs, the pictures of the king, sitting and walking, furnish a useful supplement to the descriptions of the ancients. We learn from them that the umbrella and fly-flap were already in olden times looked upon as emblems of royalty, and it is very probable that they may have been imported from India. The Avesta never speaks of these two insignia; while in the Book of Kings the umbrella has an Indian name (गृष्ण), and even in one passage of the text it is expressly styled Indian. Further, we may conclude from these sculptures that the royal throne of Persia was not covered with cushions, but that it was simply a chair quite similar to the royal chairs used in Europe. In this, as well as in other points, it is shown

¹ Fergusson, I. pp. 189, 199.

that Old-Irānian art is closely allied to Assyrian art which is more modern.¹ The throne of Darius is, indeed, very similar to that of Sennacherib;² nevertheless, these two kings have very little resemblance in other respects. While Sennacherib leans on the bow in his right hand, holding two arrows in his left, the Persian king has in his right hand a staff, which has long since been acknowledged to be a sceptre, and in his left he holds an object that has been variously explained as a cup, or a lotus, or a nosegay. The last explanation seems to me the most probable, since in later descriptions, we find the king represented as holding a quince in his hand. On the sepulchral monuments as well as on the sculptured rock of Behistān, we have observed king Darius holding a bow in his hand. The Parthian kings are likewise said to have held a bow while giving audience. In the image of Ahura Mazda the type of Assyrian art is still more apparent than in the figure of the king. Ahura Mazda is commonly represented in the form of a man having the tiara on his head. He is surrounded by a circle, to which are attached outspread wings. In some places the human figure is wanting, and the circle with the wings alone suffices for the symbol of the Supreme Being. Nor is such an emblem originally Irānian; it is found frequently in ancient monuments in Egypt, but especially in Assyria, where the god Assur is exhibited in similar form.³ Thus the idea of representing Ahura Mazda is of foreign origin, for the Persians could not consistently represent Him, as they regarded any attempt to picture the Deity as folly. The same dependence upon Assyrian art is shown also in the colossal figures of animals, which adorned the portals of the Achaemenian kings, the

¹ Vaux, "Niniveh and Persepolis," p. 330.

² *Vide* the illustration in Ménant, p. 82.

³ Cf. Ménant, p. 87.

models of which have been discovered particularly among the ruins of Khorsābād. I am inclined, however, to believe that on the Assyrian model was grafted an Irānian idea, though foreign to the original type. Perhaps the Persian colossal beasts were intended to represent Mithra and the Sun-horses, for the Irānians venerated their king as the representative of Mithra on earth. Much perplexity has always been caused by these fabulous beasts, which are seen sculptured in the various halls of the palace of Persepolis, as being on the point of fighting with some person, probably the king. In one place we see the king seizing such an animal by its horns and thrusting a dagger into its breast. The body of the animal itself seems to have been made up of different parts of various beasts. It has the head of an eagle. Half its back is covered with feathers. It is standing erect and laying its forefeet on the right arm and breast of the king. No less remarkable is a second beast; its head seems to be that of a wolf, the forepart of the body and the forefeet belong to a lion, the hindfeet to an eagle. Its body is mostly covered with feathers, while its tail resembles that of a scorpion. In a third place the king is seen to raise a lion-cub from the ground and to fondle it. A fourth beast has a horn on its forehead, a collar round its neck, and hoofs like those of a horse or bull. But it is without wings, while its long tail ends in a tuft of hair. In all these pictures the king constantly appears in the same calm attitude. At one time these beasts have been thought to be fabulous animals, at another people have sought to explain them from the Avesta, though without success. Here also the Persian figures are apparently connected with Babylonian models;¹ however, it is my conviction that these are not mere hunting scenes, the fabulous beasts are incompatible with such a theory. Here

¹ Comp. Ménant, p. 62.

also, I believe, Irānian ideas underlie symbols of foreign origin, and M. Lassen may be right in considering these fabulous beasts to be monsters corresponding to those mentioned in the inscription (H)—personified evils and vices suppressed without any difficulty by the king's just government.

It has already been stated above that the history of the development of Irānian art shows a gap, which begins with the last period of the Achaemenidae and ends with the rise of the Sassanidae. So we are, for a space of six centuries, without any information about Irānian art; nevertheless, following Mr. G. Rawlinson's example,¹ we venture here to give a description of the ruins of Hathra. We cannot, it is true, assert with certainty, yet we may suppose with probability, that they belong to the period of the Arsacidae. The town of Hathra did not lie in the Parthian territory properly so-called; still it had its own kings who were tributary to the Parthians. The town was well fortified and we know that Trajan as well as Severus failed to capture it; however, it cannot have long survived the dynasty of the Arsacidae. When Ammianus Marcellinus (25, 8, 5), visited the spot in 363 A.D., he found the town in ruins; and it may, therefore, be true, as some of the Oriental writers relate, that Hathra was destroyed under Shapur I. So this town, whose ruins still exist, must have been destroyed in the first half of the third century A.D. The ruins of Hathra are about an English mile in diameter.² They are surrounded by a nearly circular wall of considerable thickness, the strength of which was further increased by towers erected at intervals of 60 paces. Outside the wall is a deep trench, which is now dry, and

¹ "The Sixth Monarchy," pp. 372 seq.

² With the following compare Ross, "Journey from Baghdād to Al Hadhr" in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, vol. IX. pp. 467 seq.; and also Fergusson, vol. I. pp. 378 seq.

beyond this ditch is again a thick wall. The space inclosed within them is divided by a channel, running from north to south, into two unequal halves, the larger half lying on the western, the smaller on the eastern side. The latter does not seem to have been inhabited, and was, I believe, used as a burial-ground. But towards the west there are heaps of ruins, among which those in the middle of the circle are the most considerable. They seem to belong to a palace and a temple,¹ and lie in a space inclosed by walls, forming an oblong quadrangle 800 feet long and 700 broad. The principal edifice seems to have had its entrance from the east, with a small wing lying on the west. It contained four small and three large chambers, and a room behind one of the large and three of the small ones. The large halls are 60 feet high, 90 feet long, and 35 to 40 paces broad. They seem to have been vaulted but had no windows, only receiving light by means of the seven great doors leading into the edifice. The outside of the chief façade is decorated with pillars on which are carved heads of men and women. Between the fourth and fifth doors stands a gryphon. The inside of the small apartments (30 ft. long and 20 ft. broad) has no decorations whatever. In the large chambers, however, are seen pillars ornamented at both ends, and two or three feet below the ceiling an ornamental border running all round, with two or three human heads carved beneath it.² The palace, like almost all the structures in that town, is built of limestone. The temple itself seems to have been surrounded by a vaulted passage into which light entered through two windows. The gate of this temple had a fine frieze bearing, I believe, a religious significance; the interior is without any decoration.

¹ Not a temple, but a staircase, according to Fergusson (vol. I. p. 379).

² Cf. the illustration in Ross.

It is probable, though uncertain, that this edifice had formerly an upper storey. The whole seems to have some resemblance to the Tāq-i-Kesra, mentioned in Ktesiphon. Perhaps the Parthian palace, which was destroyed by the Romans, was similar in appearance. The ruins of Hathra lead us to assume that it was built entirely after a Roman model. Nevertheless, its execution is so clumsy that we cannot possibly suppose that it was erected under the superintendence of a Roman architect.¹

To the Parthian period are also attributed, with great probability, some bas-reliefs, which M. Bode has discovered in Susiana. They are seen in Teng-i-Salek in the province of Bakhtiyāris. A group of 15 persons is arranged in two rows. The first person in each row is sitting, the rest are standing. They surround a figure, which appears to represent a Magus, and which is comparatively in a state of good preservation. It wears trowsers, and over them an upper garment with sleeves and a knot over the breast, a pointed cap on the head, and a beard on its chin and upper lip. Besides, it wears plaited hair, which specially points to the Arsacian and Sassanian periods, whilst the more ancient and graceful arrangement of the hair in curls is Median (Xen. *Cyrop.* I. 32).² The figure has its left hand on its breast, the right one is raised, beside it stands on a stone—some object formed like a sugar-loaf—adorned with garlands and ribbons. To the same period, likewise, pertains a second bas-relief, representing a rider in his long garment, just as he pierces with a spear an animal, probably a bear, rushing against him, while he holds a bow in his left hand. Here also appears under the tiara the rich hair characteristic of later times. On the same rock we observe also a third bas-relief, which

¹ This is the opinion of Fergusson.

² Herodotus, too, speaks of the long hair of the Persians (VI.19).

seems to picture a woman reposing on a couch and holding in her hand a garland. Her rich hair is dressed in the ordinary manner; beside her stand three men, one without weapons by her couch, and two others at her feet holding spears. That these bas-reliefs really belong to the Parthian period cannot positively be determined. More doubtful still is the question regarding another monument yet undescribed. The rock of Behistān contains, along with the inscriptions of Darius I., also a bas-relief of more recent date, but greatly damaged.¹ We can here make out another group of riders armed with lances, one of whom is crowned with an image of the Goddess of Victory. This bas-relief has been ascribed to the Parthian period, because of a Greek inscription, which is no less mutilated than the whole monument, but of which the following words can still be read distinctly:—ΑΛΦΑΣΛΤΗΣ ΜΙΘΡΑΤΗΣΠΕΓ (*ALPHASATES MITHRATESPEG*) and further down the words:— ΓΩΤΑΡΖΗΣ ΣΑΤΡΑΠΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΤΡΑΠ (*Gōtarzes Satrapes tōn satrap*) and quite at the end: ΓΩΤΑΡΣΗΣ ΓΕΟΠΟΘΡΟΣ (*Gōtarzes Geopothros*). As regards Alphasates, I am at one with Mr. G. Rawlinson in assuming that we should regard it as another form of the name Arpakhshad.² But if from the name of Gōtarzes it might be concluded that that inscription owes its origin to the Arsacian king of that name, I cannot assent to such an opinion; for the Gōtarzes mentioned above does not call himself Great-King, but "Satrap of the Satraps," a title, which though otherwise uncommon, is identical with the Greek *σατράπης μεγιστάνων* ("the Satrap of the Chiefs"), which is assumed by Behrām Chōbin (Theophyl. 4, 7). The Arsacian Gōtarzes is, furthermore, a son to Artabanus III.; and the concluding words of the inscription can, therefore, only

¹ Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 151 *seq.* Rawlinson, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. IX. p. 114.

² Cf. Rawlinson, *ibid.* vol. IX. p. 111.

imply that this Gōtarzes was a son of Geo, *i.e.* Gév. Now in the Book of Kings, Gèv is really the son and not the father of Gudarz, which proves that the inscription does not, indeed, refer to the Gudarz of the legend. But, since the two names occur rather frequently, there may have been a Gōtarzes, whose father was named Gév. And since it was also the custom of the Sassanian kings to engrave their bas-reliefs side by side with the Achaemenian monuments, I am so much the more inclined to transfer this bas-relief to the period of the Sassanidae, as Mr. G. Rawlinson has also found similar Sassanian architectural monuments in its neighbourhood. As regards the use of the Greek language in this case, it is well known that even on the monuments of the first Sassanidae we meet with Greek inscriptions.

More doubtful still is a bas-relief found near Holvân. It represents a rider to whom a garland is being presented by a man standing near him. Beside it is engraved rather a long inscription in unknown characters, which have not yet been deciphered, and so no definite opinion can possibly be formed about it. The same is the case with regard to the bas-reliefs seen by M. Ferrier in the country of the Aimaks and the Hazâres, the date of which will surely be determined by future investigations. To various ancient relics found in Warka and Niffer,¹ such as biers, vessels of glass or clay, etc., a Parthian origin has been ascribed; but here also the matter is not decided.

Our position becomes somewhat more satisfactory when we turn to the Sassanian period; however, its palaces and bas-reliefs cannot be considered collectively like those of the Achaemenian epoch, because they are scattered over different places. Of the Sassanian buildings so few have survived, that we cannot say much regarding architectural development in their time. The reason may be, that the

¹ Cf. Layard, "Niniveh and Babylon," p. 558. Loftus, "Chaldea and Susiana," pp. 202, 214.

Sassanidae were not peculiarly inclined to erect great edifices, or perhaps that their palaces lay, for the most part, in the low country near the Tigris, and so may have been mostly built of brick. The Sassanidae had, indeed, adopted the models exhibited in the buildings of Hathra,¹ yet in course of time such very considerable changes were introduced, that a perfectly new style arose among them. The large tunnel-like halls of Hathra were retained, but they only served for entrances. The separating walls were pierced by lofty arches, and so was formed a row of chambers. Furthermore, the Sassanidae knew how to adorn their halls with cupolas. Their buildings are always oblong quadrangles, with great doors in the middle, which form the chief entrance, and are as broad as the halls to which they lead. The chambers are joined to one another, without passages between, so that we can pass directly from one to the other. Each of the Sassanian palaces contains an interior court whence one can find entrance to all the rooms adjoining it. The depth of the buildings varies, being sometimes not much greater than the breadth, at others twice as great. In some cases the exterior wall, which, as a rule, contains several doors, has but a single entrance. The chief entrance, however, is always in the middle of the front; from it we can look into the entire edifice in the Tâq-i-Kesra to a depth of 115 feet. The cupolas or domes, which are numerous in these structures, are full of small apertures, which serve to admit light. In the walls there were also windows. The oldest and smallest of these palaces is that of Serbistân erected, according to Mr. Fergusson, in 350 A.D.² It is entered by three deep tunnel-like openings between which there are groups of three semi-circular pilasters, each extremity

¹ Cf. Fergusson, vol. I. pp. 382 seq., and particularly G. Rawlinson, "The Seventh Monarchy," pp. 580 seq.

² Cf. Fergusson, vol. I. p. 386.

having again a single pilaster. The length of the palace is 138 feet, the breadth 122 feet. The entrances face the west. Through them we reach the halls, of which the central one at the principal entrance has the least depth. Thence we enter the largest chamber, which is vaulted. On the other side of this large chamber there is a court upon which doors open from the various apartments. The large chamber leads also into halls towards the north and south.—The palace of Firuzabad, which must have been built, according to Mr. Fergusson, about 450 A.D., is larger. It is about 390 ft. long and 180 ft. broad; it has only one entrance, a large gate, which is about 50 feet high and faces the north. It leads first into a vaulted hall, 90 ft. long and 43 ft. broad. On each side there are two similar chambers, though smaller in size. We next enter through small but elegant doors three vaulted chambers which occupy the whole breadth of the edifice, each about 43 feet square, the vault rising 70 feet high. The door and false windows—the latter being intended only for ornament—point to the influence of the Persepolitan style. These vaulted chambers lead again into some smaller apartments and thence into a court 90 feet square, into which open again various apartments decorated on the inside with false windows, which, however, are executed far less skilfully than those in the vaulted chambers. The exterior of the palace was very prettily adorned by means of long narrow arches and long cylindrical pilasters. The whole has an appearance of stern simplicity, and is altogether less handsome than the smaller palace in Serbistān. The most spacious of the Sassanian palaces is the celebrated Taq-i-Kesra, the only surviving relic of the ancient Ktesiphon. The Oriental historiographers, who regard it as a marvel of splendour, sometimes ascribe it to Khosrav I. and sometimes to Khosrav II. It was probably founded about 550 A.D., and, therefore, only begun

under Khosrav I.¹ What remains of it, is a mere fragment, and it is impossible to restore the plan of the whole structure. The façade resembles that of the palace of Firuzabad, but is much more splendid, being 370 ft. broad and 105 ft. high. The remains still in existence compose the entrance and a vaulted hall, 72 ft. broad, 85 ft. high, and 115 ft. deep; and we might here assume that there likewise stood chambers on both sides as in the other palaces. A similar relic in Iran itself is the Takht-i-Bostan, which we shall describe below. Another Sassanian palace was unexpectedly discovered a short time ago at Mashita in the country of Moab.² It must have been erected by Khosrav II., about the time when this sovereign marched victorious to the neighbourhood of Byzantium, and it proves that this king strove to retain all the conquests he had then made. The whole palace is an extensive quadrangle of 500 ft. in each direction, but only the interior portion of about 170 feet square was completed. The palace was evidently intended to be a hunting-seat for the king near the edge of the desert. It is built of brick quite after the model of the other Sassanian palaces. A vaulted hall, which was formerly crowned by a cupola, forms the centre. There are also on each side eight chambers, with courts between them. The entrance lay on the north side, whence three vaulted doorways, separated only by columns of hard white stone, led into the building. The capitals of these columns are like those which came into fashion in the age of the Emperor Justinian, a circumstance which helps us to determine the date of the edifice. A second building is separated from the first by a court of nearly 200 feet square; but it seems to have been intended for other

¹ According to Theophylactus (5, 6 seq.) Justinian sent to Khosrav I. Greek workmen as well as the materials for the erection of his palace.

² Comp. H. B. Tristram, "The Land of Moab" (London, 1873), pp. 195 seq. Mashita (ماشیة) means "winter-quarters."

purposes. Probably it contained rooms for the guards. The exterior of this palace is much more ornate than the other palaces of the Sassanidae, which evidently proves that Greek workmen were specially employed in building it, as was no doubt the case when the Sassanidae erected palaces within the limits of their own empire. The Book of Kings does not at all deny that Greek, as well as Indian workmen, were employed in constructing the Tâq-i-Kesra. We know that Khosrav I. carried off the finest works of art of Damascus into his own country, when that city was destroyed; so it is thereby acknowledged that Irânian artists could not vie with those of Greece.

We shall now consider the bas-reliefs of the Sassanidae, which we find for the most part in the neighbourhood of the Achaemenian monuments, a clear proof that the first Sassanidae were still very probably conscious of their connection with the older Southern Irânian dynasty. It is especially in Persis that we meet with monuments of that kind. If we pass from Murghâb to Persepolis, we find the first Sassanian monument in the valley of Hâjiâbâd, which is bounded on the western side by the rocks of Naqsh-i-Rustem. An English mile north of this village, we observe in a rocky cavern a long inscription of Shapur I., without any other monuments of art. These begin at first with Naqsh-i-Rustem itself. On the same rock on which the Achaemenian sepulchres are found, though only a little lower, we meet with six bas-reliefs of the Sassanian period, of which the first is seen after passing the easternmost sepulchre. The two principal figures face each other, and each holds a garland trimmed with ribbons.¹ According to more ancient drawings, the ribbons are shown to have hung down over the figure of a child, which has now become quite indistinct. The person holding the garland with his right hand is the

¹ Cf. Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 530, and the illustration, pl. 16.

king, who wears a balloon-like cap with streaming ribbons, such as are often seen on coins. The hair of his head is rich and flowing, as is common with the Sassanidae. In his ear he wears a pearl. His wide garment is kept together by means of a girdle. The second figure has been variously explained as that of a woman or a eunuch. It wears a mural crown for head-dress with flowers and fluttering ribbons; the hair hangs down the shoulders in plaits. A third person behind the king, with a raised forefinger and a Phrygian cap, which appears to terminate in the head of a horse, is generally considered to be a servant. Some believe they recognize in the figure of the king a resemblance to the image of Vararan V. on his coins. Since Sir R. Ker Porter wrote, it has, therefore, been assumed that we have here a picture of this Vararan, and Sir George Ouseley also believes he has made out the name of that king in a long inscription which stands by the side of this bas-relief. As we not unfrequently meet with similar pictures, I must here remark that the garland or ring, appearing on these monuments, seems to me to be no other than what we observe, in the older monuments, in the hand of Ahura Mazda, possibly a symbol of the Empire of the Universe. Hence it follows that the second figure that holds the ring, may have been intended to represent a deity; for I do not believe that the Sassanidae were specially inclined to share the honour of their victories with any human creature. The person standing behind the king might also be regarded rather as a divine than a human being; it certainly represents a supernatural adviser.

On the second bas-relief is figured a combat,¹ in which an Irānian king, perhaps the same as in the foregoing, pushes with his lance a retreating enemy before him. Behind the king is carried a standard. The ordinary

¹ Ker Porter, vol. I. p. 537 and pl. 20.

supposition, that it represents the victory of Vararan V. over the sovereign of Tūrān, seems to me to be very uncertain.

The third bas-relief is one of the best known, and imitations of it are found elsewhere too.¹ It pictures an Irānian king crowned and on horseback. His left hand is laid on the pommel of his sword, while with his right he holds the hands, covered with sleeves, of a man standing near him. The latter wears the Roman costume. So, too, does a second figure, that kneels in a suppliant attitude before the king. The same figure appears again behind the king as in the first bas-relief. It is commonly believed that we have here the scene of the capture of the emperor Valerian by Shapur II., in which the kneeling figure is the emperor himself, while the one standing is Cyriades, who was put into his place. Since the same picture occurs again in the ruins of Shāpur and Dârâbgerd, this supposition is to a certain extent probable.

The fourth bas-relief is much like the second;² but here the lance of the retreating adversary is broken. The crown of the king, which differs entirely from the ordinary shape, is of some interest.

In the fifth bas-relief there again appear two riders with the ring.³ Here we find inscriptions, too, which inform us that the horseman, who wears the mural crown, is Ahura Mazda, and that the second one who receives the ring as the emblem of royalty, and behind whom stands a person with a fly-flap, is no other than Ardeshir I., the founder of the Sassanian dynasty. Beneath the feet of each rider lies a king, evidently dead. The one on the side of Ahura Mazda wears serpents instead of hair; he may be supposed to be a usurper.

¹ Ker Porter, p. 540 and pl. 21.

² *Ibid.*, vol. I. p. 544 and pl. 22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 548 and pl. 23.

Lastly, the sixth bas-relief pictures a king, standing on a kind of platform, with his nobles seated round him.¹

Advancing further from the rock of Naqsh-i-Rustem in the direction of Persepolis, we come first to the inconsiderable ruins of Istakhr, the ancient capital of Irān, the strong citadel of which was built upon a mountain. According to Oriental opinion the Sassanian kings were reluctant to build on the very ruins of their predecessors, and, therefore, established their new residence in their immediate neighbourhood. Between Istakhr and Chihilminār there is, on the sepulchral mountain of Persepolis, a roofless grotto cut in the rock, having its three walls on the north, south, and east covered with sculpture.² On the southern wall we find again a representation of the two riders holding a ring; but the engraving is not so skilful, and evidently executed by less practised hands. Besides Ahura Mazda and the king, all the other subordinate characters are here wanting. On the eastern wall we find a repetition of the scene including the attendants, but here the two principal characters are standing. On the northern wall we see the picture of a horseman together with his attendants on foot. The heads of the rider and of the horse have been effaced; but the inscriptions record that Shapur I. is here represented.

To Persis belong a few more bas-reliefs found by Sir R. Ker Porter in the neighbourhood of Shiraz.³ One group consists of a woman holding her flowing veil in the left hand, and stretching out the right one to a person who is offering her a flower. As the latter wears no crown, I doubt whether it is the figure of the king or not. The image of the Sassanian king appears twice on the same wall, in the usual manner, but badly executed.

¹ Ker Porter, p. 551 and pl. 24.

² *Ibid.* p. 371, pl. 27. Niebuhr, pl. 32 A.

³ *Ibid.* p. 706, pl. 57.

Finally, we must again mention here the ruins of the city named Shâpûr. They are six leagues distant from the town of Kâzerûn, on a mountain to the north, in a romantic neighbourhood. The ruins have a circumference of about two leagues. On a rising ground which is at right angles to the eastern side of the mountain, but quite isolated, are the ruins of a castle, which seems to have had mighty towers and walls covered with bas-reliefs of the Sassanian period. In the first we see the horsemen, already familiar to us, and a man lying prostrate at their feet. The figures are colossal, but are much damaged by time. Before one of the riders kneels a man in a suppliant posture. The second bas-relief is by far more important and is divided into nine panels. In the middle panel the king appears on horseback, wearing the Sasanian crown and the coiffure waving behind. Underneath the hoofs of his horse is again the outstretched corpse of a vanquished enemy. Before him kneels a man in Roman costume, while two figures stand behind, one of which is beardless and wears a Phrygian cap. The king is holding the hands of a man in Roman costume, while a winged genius hovers above him. Perhaps in earlier times there was also an inscription. In the second of the principal panels, which is to the left side of the middle one, are two divisions, each of which contains six figures on horseback, all raising the right hand and the fore-finger. They are the suite of the king, probably his counsellors. The third panel, on the right of the middle one, has six sub-divisions, each with three persons carrying various articles, which seem to be partly building implements, partly presents. These figures, like those of the middle panel, have a height of 5 ft. 9 inches, while the riders on the left of the king are only of about half this height. Some more bas-reliefs are found on the opposite bank of a little river. Here we see, in a relief divided into five panels, the king in the midst, and represented, which is indeed exceptional, *en face*. He

grasps with his left hand his sword ; his right is stretched out. As to the two divisions on his right the characters in the uppermost tier raise their hands and fore-fingers ; in the second are probably servants, one of whom holds a richly caparisoned horse by the bridle. On the left side of the king are two more rows of persons, the chief of whom carries two human heads, while a little boy clings to the skirt of his garment. The fourth panel again exhibits the images of two colossal riders holding the coronal ring, which are said to be particularly well executed. The fifth relief is a hunting-piece, but much damaged. We recognize in it the person of the king on horseback, with a bow and two arrows in his hand as well as the heads of men, horses, and camels.

A hundred steps further there is another relief cut in a concave form. Its subject seems to be very much the same as that of the second and third reliefs. The middle piece, which takes up the greatest space, exhibits the ordinary picture of the victorious king with a dead body lying at his feet, and the Roman kneeling by the side of his horse. But here we have beside the king a man in Sassanian costume, offering the coronal ring to the king. Farther to the right there stand, in the first row, a number of persons with folded arms ; in the second and third rows persons carrying baskets, etc. ; while in the corner is a man leading a lion by a chain. In the fourth row, directly opposite to the king, are six persons in loose plaited garments, who might, therefore, be supposed to be Indians. They carry various objects, or lead different animals, such as horses, elephants, &c. Amongst them we see men in Roman costume, and a chariot with two horses harnessed to it. On the left side there are five troops of riders, who are apparently the king's retinue. Finally, we have to mention a finely constructed edifice which is a quarter of a league from the sixth relief. Near its entrance there formerly stood several sphinxes, some traces of which may still be recognized.

In Media, as in Persis, the Sassanian kings erected their monuments close to those of their ancestors. About two *farasangs* or four miles from Behistān, towards the town of Kirmānshāh, we still observe the scanty remains of a palace which Mr. G. Rawlinson ascribes to the Sassanians. Eight or nine bases and capitals are all that may still be seen; but the distance of the first of these ruinous bases from the last is about 300 paces, and it, therefore, seems that an edifice of considerable size must have previously stood here. On the same mountain tract, which contains the monuments of Darius, but farther to the west, towards Kirmānshāh, there are sculptured engravings which are now known by the name of Taq-i-Bostān, *i.e.*, the "Vault of the Garden," or also of Takht-i-Bostān, "Throne of the Garden." The romantic narratives of the modern Persians profess to give the name of the artist, to whom we owe these monuments. He is supposed to have been called Ferhād and to have loved Shīrīn, the beautiful wife of Khosrav II. In her honour, it is said, Ferhād executed these figures and erected the adjoining structures.—Here we must remark that the Book of Kings does not give the least hint of this romantic love-story,¹ which seems to have been invented in later times and without any historical foundation.—The carvings begin at a place where a limpid brook rushes forth from the rocky wall and flows into the river Kārā-sū. Above this brook there is a relief called by the neighbouring people the "Relief of the Four Calenders."² It contains the figures of four men, one of whom lies prostrate on the ground. Over his head stands another figure wearing a mural crown surmounted with the ornamental ball, so common among the Sassanians, and a necklace of pearls and a diadem. The hair is thick.

¹ The story is briefly related in the Persian Tabari (2, p. 298), and at length by Ker Porter (vol. II. pp. 179 seq.)

² Comp. Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 169, 191 seq. and pl. 66.

A light flowing garment is fastened together over the breast and a girdle goes round the waist. The others are similarly dressed. The second person wears a close-fitting helmet with the Sassanian ball, and four ribbons of unequal length fluttering behind. Both hold the well-known coronal ring; and, I believe, we do not err if we regard the first to be Ahura Mazda, and the second to be a Sassanian king. Behind the king we observe a person with a great halo round his head and a kind of sceptre in his hand, standing perhaps on a sun-flower. In my opinion the image represents Mithra, the guardian *yazata* of the royal family.¹

Not far from the bas-relief just described, a staircase leads to a platform, whereon we discover the traces of a statue, which must formerly have stood there. The broken statue itself lies in the rivulet below and is the figure of a king. But the most precious monuments are engraved in two grottoes at the foot of the rock.² The larger one is 24 feet broad, 21 feet deep, and the vault is 50 feet high. The walls of the grotto are neatly polished. The entrance to the hall is through a vaulted gate, as is generally the case in Sassanian palaces. Over the arch there is a half-moon, on either side of which is a figure quite resembling an angel holding in the one hand the well-known coronal ring, in the other probably a goblet. Similar figures are also found on the Arsacian coins as well as on some Sassanian monuments. Perhaps the idea was borrowed from the old manner of representing Ahura Mazda. On entering through the doorway, we observe the colossal figure of a rider carved between two columns of the Corinthian style. It is clad in mail, extending from the face to the knees, and beneath it are indications of a richly embroidered garment. In the right hand is a shield, a heavy lance rests on the shoulder. The horse also is partly covered with

¹ This image is also supposed to represent the Irānian Prophet.

² Ker Porter, vol. II. pp. 169 seq., and the illustrations, pls. 62-64.

armour. Here still exist traces of an inscription in the Irānian and Greek languages, but too indistinct to be deciphered. In the panel above the rider there are three figures; the middle one is richly clothed and apparently represents the king, wearing a crown with the ball or globe, and the rich plaited hair. Over his robe and trowsers, which seem to have been nicely embroidered, he wears a coat-of-mail, the left hand holding the hilt of his sword. On his left there is a female figure, likewise magnificently dressed, pouring water from a vessel in her hand. The figure on the right wears a diadem and a long beard, a mantle fastened over the breast hangs over its shoulders; it offers to the king the coronal circlet so often referred to. I do not doubt but that the female figure on the left represents Anāhita, and the figure on the right Mithra. The pictures on the side-walls of the grotto are easily explained. They are hunting scenes. On one of the reliefs the king is represented on horseback, armed with bow and arrows, while an umbrella is held over him. The king is pursuing a number of antelopes; the horsemen overtake them; and, a little farther on, the animals are seen slain. Behind the king is a company of musicians. In one of the lateral panels we behold a number of men riding on the backs of elephants, who drive the game towards the king; in the opposite panel we see camels carrying the slaughtered animals. On the second wall a boar-hunt is represented. The scene is apparently a lake, the banks of which are covered over with dense bushes and forests. Here also we see elephants endeavouring to force the boars across the midst of the lake, where there is, in a boat, a man much taller than the rest, and richly dressed, in the act of shooting at the approaching animals. A little farther off, in another boat, there is a second man similar to the former, but not so tall, having round his head a circle, which is supposed to represent a nimbus. I believe this is a two-

fold representation of the king. The second person is in the act of taking a bow from the hand of a servant; on his side stands a female harper. Female musicians are also seen in other boats. On the edge of the relief we see persons engaged in piling the boars, which have been slain, on the backs of elephants.

The second grotto is by far less spacious than the first.¹ It is only 19 ft. broad and 12 ft. deep; its exterior is not decorated. Opposite the entrance we see a bas-relief exhibiting two figures, both dressed quite alike; they wear crowns and the thick hair of the Sassanidae. Their costume is not particularly handsome; but they wear necklaces, and the hilts of their swords are ornamented. Two inscriptions tell us who they are. One is Shāpūr, 'King of Kings,' son to Ormazd; the second Shāpūr, 'King of Kings,' son to Shāpūr and grandson to Ormazd; they are, therefore, Shāpūr II. and Shāpūr III. The workmanship is rather clumsy; the hunting-scenes and the ornaments at the entrance of the first grotto are of much higher artistic value. If we further mention the unfinished bas-relief found by Sir Robert Ker Porter in the ruins of Rai, we believe that we have completed the list of the most important Sassanian monuments.

We have still to speak briefly of Irānian coins. The Dareiki have already been referred to (page 661).² The Arsacian coins need not be discussed here on account of their Greek character, though the effigies and ornaments

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 187 seq. and pl. 65.

² [“It was a pure gold coin struck by order of Darius I. It represented the king in a kneeling posture, habited in his flowing garment with the royal tiara, holding in his right hand the royal staff, perhaps a lance or a sword, and in his left a bow. According to Tabari the king was in olden time represented on both sides of the Dirhem; on the one seated on the throne with the crown on his head, on the other on horseback with the lance in his hand.”—*Tr. n.*]

of the Arsacian kings deserve also the attention of the Irānian archæologist.

As to the Sassanian kings, we find the finest specimens of their coinage in the beginning of their dynasty under Ardashir I.¹ From the time of Shāpūr II. they deteriorate perceptibly and degenerate under Peroes to the verge of barbarism, and continue so under the succeeding sovereigns. Under Khosrov II. there appears some improvement, but after that there is no real progress, and the same defects appear in the coins of the last Sassanidae.

As for music, we can only remark that it was always popular in Irān; but we do not know anything more definite about it. Vararan V. was very fond of music.² He not only had female Greek lute-players in his suite, but he is even said to have introduced Indian music in Persia. At the court of Khosrov II. two singers, Bārbad and Sargash (Sergius), are mentioned in the Book of Kings. We may suppose them to have been Greeks, and there can be no reason to doubt that Greek as well as Indian music was not unfrequently heard at the court of the Irānian sovereigns.

¹ Comp. Mordtmann, *Zeitschrift ddmG.* vol. VIII. 7. As for the other relics of the Sassanidae we refer to Mr. Ed. Thomas, "Early Sassanian Inscriptions, Seals, and Coins." London, 1873.

² Cf. J. Darmesteter, "The Origin of Persian Poetry":—"One day king Behram Gor of historic and legendary memory was at the feet of his mistress, the beautiful Del Ārām. He told her of his love, she spoke to him of her own. Their words were an echo of the harmony in which their hearts beat together. It is thus that poetry, rhyme, and rhythm took births in Persia.—The legend is beautiful but a little too late . . . Seven centuries before Behram Gor and Del Ārām, the companions of Alexander the Great had heard the poets of Susa sing the loves of Zariates and Odatis . . . But all this poetry is lost to us; what is left is a remnant devoid of all charms, the famous Gāthās of the Zend Avesta, rhythmical sermons which breath irreproachable morals, and which offer all the poetic interest of a catechism." *Vide 'Indian Spectator,' Aug. 15, 1886.—Tr. n.]*

APPENDIX.

III. THE IRĀNIAN ALPHABETS.

THE ancient Persians made use of two distinct characters. So early as in the Inscriptions of Darius the term *dipiš* denotes an inscription ; and this word may be derived from a verbal root *dip*, which has been preserved also in other Irānian languages in different derivatives. To this root we might especially trace the Greek word διφνέρα which was employed by Ktesias and other Greek writers as a name for the Persian Annals ; but which, as may be gathered from the testimony of Herodotus (V. 58), was used at an early period to denote a book or a manuscript. Herodotus seems to believe that the word was originally Greek, and perhaps derived from δέφω ; but this opinion is distinctly erroneous, for the word is strictly Persian and comes from *dip* ; even to the present day the Persian word *defter* means a book. From the same root we have the words *dibistān*, "a writing-room, a school" ; *dévān* or *dīvān*, which means "a writing-book, or chamber" in the Armenian archives, and the Mod. Persian word *diwér*, Arm. *dpir*, "a writer." As regards the original meaning of the root *dip*, I suppose it to be identical with the Skr. *lip*, "to besmear," and, therefore, also contained in the words *lipi* ("spreading over, writing") and *lipikara* ("white-washer, writer"). This supposition is not contradicted by the fact that the inscription, which Darius calls *dipiš*, is cut on rocks, since we know that the engraved letters were also overlaid with gold or painted. On the contrary, this view is confirmed by the Mod. Persian words دیوار *dewār*, "wall," and جَبَاج *débāj*, "brocade;"

which must be traced to the same root. Another Old Persian expression for writing is *ni-pish*, which is also used by Darius and contained in the Mod. Persian *nivishtan*. It seems to have migrated further westward and to have found a place in the Sclavonian dialect, wherein words like *pismo*, "writing," &c., point to the existence of a root *pish*, to which might also belong the Old Prussian words:—*peisaton*, "written"; *peisalei*, "writing." Accordingly, we are able to point to the use of two distinct terms for the art of writing among the Southern Irānians. However, the case is different with respect to Northern Irān. Here we find a name for a written document only in the word *naska*, which may be identified as a word borrowed from the Arm. ՚ՆԱՏԿԻ, "to transcribe." But this etymology is uncertain, and no other name for writing exists. Wherever books are referred to, allusion is frequently made to memory (*darethra*) and recitation (*marethra*). This circumstance shows beyond doubt that the sacred lore was originally impressed on the memory of scholars by tradition and oral instruction. It would be rash to infer from this circumstance that in olden times the use of writing was unknown to the Northern Irānians; whereas Herodotus states that Deioces, after his accession to the throne, caused most of the events of his reign to be recorded in writing. The fact, however, is that even at the present day we can only put forth conjectures as to the character of the Northern Irānian writing.

On the other hand, our knowledge regarding the style of writing in Southern Irān reaches as far as the beginning of the Achaemenian monarchy, especially if we ascribe, as we probably may, the small inscription in Murghāb to the founder of that dynasty. The earliest form of Southern writing known to us is found in the inscriptions of the Achaemenidae; consequently we have the advantage of its having been transmitted to us in the very form in which it was originally inscribed. It is a variety of the so-called cunei-

form writing, but one differing considerably from all others, which it surpasses in simplicity. This circumstance gives strength to the theory of the comparatively later origin of the Old Persian cuneiform writing, which is locally the most Eastern species of its kind. A more intricate system of cuneiform writing is found in translations standing side by side with the Old Persian texts. In Northern Irān we meet with inscriptions following this intricate cuneiform system, engraved by kings still unknown to us in Media as well as in Armenia. Western Irān, the land of the Euphrates and the Tigris, however, is specially famous for such specimens of cuneiform writing. On the contrary, not a single line in cuneate letters has yet been discovered eastward of Persis. Although M. Ferrier thought he had met with such inscriptions in Balkh and Farah, his belief has not been confirmed by later research, and it must, therefore, be regarded as erroneous. That the cuneate writing was confined to the western part of the Irānian kingdom, is sufficient proof that it could not have been derived from the East. It would be more reasonable to give it a northern origin; but the most probable view is that it came from the West. In dealing with this subject we need not be struck by the dependence of the Southern Irānian kingdom upon Northern and Western Irān, for we have lighted upon similar facts in other parts of our study of Irānian civilization. We repeat that the use of cuneiform writing throughout Persia proves that the latter country, as well as the whole western frontier of Irān, was more or less familiar in ancient times with the civilization of Babylon and Niniveh. Yet the specific identification of the Old Persian cuneal system with the more ancient systems, presents no insignificant difficulties. The Old Persian cuneiform writing is the only system which really deserves to be called an alphabet; all other varieties are mere syllabaries. Several peculiarities in the Old Persian writing make its identification with the *Anarian* system's

impossible. There are signs which merely stand for the vowels *i* or *u*, but none for *a*. The letter, which must be followed by *a* in reading, denotes at the same time certain vowel-less consonants. These are some of the characteristics considerably differing from the earlier systems, which contain certain signs for syllables, e.g. *ru*, *ri*, &c. The letters *m* and *v* are distinguished in the Old Persian alphabet, but not in the earlier cuneiform systems. Assyrian writing has no signs for aspirates, while the Old Persian carefully distinguishes the hard aspirates at least. These peculiarities do not allow us to connect the Old Persian alphabet either with the *Anarian* or the Assyrian syllabary: on the contrary, they exhibit some points of contact with the Babylonian. The ideographic sign for king (which would formerly have been read *naga*) is taken from the Babylonian, and lately M. Oppert has found altogether nine such signs corresponding to the Babylonian ones.¹ This circumstance supports the theory which ascribes a Babylonian origin to the Old Persian alphabet; and M. Oppert (p. 244) supposed that it was for the first time systematized by Cyrus or at his command, after the occupation of Babylon, by the Persians. For this purpose the Old Persians seem to have fixed on 36 words which were represented in Babylonian by ideograms, to each of which they attached the value of a single character. The alphabet was rendered still simpler by bringing into the new system only angular and single cuneal signs—the latter being horizontal as well as vertical—from three to five of which fundamental elements the different letters were formed.² In this way we may account for the change from the syllabic systems to the method of writing in letters;

¹ Cf. Oppert, "Sur la formation de l'alphabet perse," *Journal Asiatique*, 1874, pp. 238 seq.

² In Oppert (*ibid.*, pp. 242 seq.) we find a table of Babylonian characters from which the Old Persian alphabet is supposed to have been developed.

however, we are at a loss for any explanation of the high proficiency attained by the Persians, which led to their invention of an alphabet to replace the cumbrous mode of writing in syllables. Besides, it is scarcely possible to assume that the cuneiform writing was the only method which people could make use of during the rule of the Achaemenidae. It is true that it has many advantages for monumental inscriptions; nevertheless, its incongruities must have been felt in the ordinary intercourse of life. It is impossible to suppose that letters, edicts,¹ or literary works, for instance the royal annals mentioned by Ktesias, were written in cuneal letters. It is more probable that, along with the cuneiform alphabet, another system of writing was in use for epistolary or literary purposes. What this system was and whether it sufficiently corresponded in principle to the former, we cannot of course state, for we know nothing about it. But since a regular alphabet was known in the countries west of their own, besides the cuneiform system,² it is likely that the Old Persians may have borrowed a similar mode of writing from Babylon or Assyria and adapted it to their own language. In any case, however, it could not have been perfectly suitable for employment in the Old Persian dialect, owing to the natural want of harmony between an Indo-Germanic language and a Semitic alphabet. But such inconsistencies have lasted to the present day through the whole of Irānian history; while the inconvenience arising from the use of a Semitic alphabet need not have been insuperable, since it was used only by natives, whose knowledge of the spoken language must have made up for the deficiencies of the written alphabet.

The period of the Achaemenidae was followed by the empire of the Parthians; and we have already stated that

¹ Herodotus I. pp. 124, 125.

² Comp. Schrader, *Die Assyrisch-Babylon. Keilinschriften*, p. 167.

the Arsacidae stamped their coins with Greek legends in Greek characters. But, on the other hand, a number of coins are still preserved, which owe their origin to the age of the Arsacidae, probably to the satraps (viceroys), and which are inscribed in the native language and character. Upon these coins M. Levy has based an elaborate and admirable treatise—his “History of Irānian Writing in the Parthian Period.”¹ Most of the coins alluded to in this work belong to Hamadān, Sherāz, and Kermān,² i. e. to the South and West of the kingdom. That they owe their origin to the Irānians can be clearly demonstrated, since they exhibit the device of a fire-altar and a man standing before it in prayer. On several of them we observe also the image of Ahura Mazda himself, similar to the symbol of Him found on earlier monuments. The effigy of the king also supports this view. Indeed, he does not wear the high tiara of the Great King, but he has an Irānian head-dress, which on the later coins is evidently the *Patidāna*. On one of these coins, however, the king is shown holding a sceptre, a flower, and a goblet, as on the monuments of Persepolis. All these circumstances evince the correctness of M. Levy's theory that these coins must be ascribed to the Irānian satraps. This seems to have been indicated also by the position of the king's face, looking towards the right, whereas the image of the Great King always looks towards the left. The coins bear legends in indigenous characters; the letters belong to the Aramaic alphabet of the fourth and third century B. C., as it was used on monuments in Asia Minor, as well as on the coins, seals, monumental columns, and papyrus fragments discovered in Egypt.³ Hence it might be inferred that

¹ Cf. Levy, *Beiträge zur aramäischen Munzkunde Irāns und zur kunde der älteren Pehlevischrift*, ZddmG. vol. XXI. pp. 421 seq. Cf. also Franc. Lenormant, *Etudes sur l'alphabet Pehlvi*, *Journal Asiatique*, 1865, vol. II. pp. 180 seq.

² Levy, *ibid*, p. 438.

³ *Ibid*, p. 428.

the Persian satraps, to whom the coins belonged, caused them to be struck, if not under the sovereignty of Alexander, then under the Seleucidae and throughout the whole period of the Arsacidae; and during this epoch a species of Aramaic writing may have been naturalized in Irān. Inscriptions with traces of a similar character have been found also in Holvan and Khuzistān.¹ They seem to have been akin to the Nabatæan and Palmyrene alphabets, but the samples of them now existing are not quite sufficient to allow of any definite opinion being formed regarding them. The question as to the origin of those inscriptions will, therefore, remain undetermined until solved by further research. Another group of coins has a bearing on the history of Irānian writing. The more modern ones are like those described above; yet they must be placed before the beginning of the Sassanian dynasty. These coins are divided into two classes. The greater number of those included in the first class must be assigned on numismatic principles to the time of Phraates I. and Mithridates I., while some of the remaining ones may perhaps belong to the reign of Phraates IV.² To these coins M. Levy traces the so-called Parthian writing, which he is inclined to call Western Pahlavi. It is found on the monuments ascribed to the first Sassanidae, but not on their coins; and after their time it becomes quite extinct. The coins comprised in the other class must, according to M. Levy,³ be ascribed to the time of Vologeses II. (130-149 A.D.). The alphabets on the coins of both these classes are now regarded as the forerunner of the species of writing current under the first of the Sassanidæ. It follows, then, that the latter cannot have been developed from the former,

¹ Levy, *ibid*, p. 445.

² *Vide* tablet II. Nos. 1—10 in Levy who places the coins numbered 8 and 9 in the time of Phraates IV.

³ *Ibid*, p. 455.

but that both must have sprung at the same time from the Aramaic alphabet, which ought to be considered as their common parent, and which is found on weights, seals, and gems belonging to the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Achaemenian monarchies. From the same alphabet first arose what has been styled the Southern Pahlavi writing, which M. Levy would call Eastern Pahlavi;¹ while the alphabet, which is known as the Parthian or Persian Pahlavi, must be distinguished as Western Pahlavi, which dies out after the inscriptions of the first two Sassanidae. Eastern Pahlavi, on the contrary, remained in use and developed gradually into the form in which we find it on the later Sassanian coins and in the Parsi manuscripts. We quite agree with this view of the development of the history of Irānian writing; only we admit that we cannot exactly account for the names Eastern and Western Pahlavi. Although I concede that this species of writing may have been current already at a very remote period in Eastern Irān, where the oldest Indian character (the so-called Arian, the use of which for an Irānian language cannot be proved), may have existed with it, and that the Eastern Irānians may have possibly employed it whenever they wrote anything, still we must hold to our supposition that there are no facts before us to show that this alphabet was first introduced precisely into Eastern Irān, and thence gradually extended to the West. According to our opinion, we can here, again, distinguish between North and South. The so-called Western Pahlavi was chiefly current in the North, in the territory belonging to the Parthians. It died out after the fall of the Arsacidae, since, as the power of the Sassanidae grew in the South, the style of writing there current prevailed. The most important point here is that no essential difference ever existed between these two alphabets, and that both of them owed their origin unques-

¹ Levy, p. 456.

tionably to Western Semitic. Hence it is that vowels are imperfectly distinguished in all such alphabets, since they contain only three vowel-signs, *viz.* those for *a*, *i*, and *u*. Such a deficiency must have been very inconvenient in an Indo-Germanic language, as all the vowels could not have been accurately indicated by those three signs as in the Semitic languages. So the alphabet became in course of time more and more developed, as, from the time of Kobad I., writers began to employ an increasing number of new combinations consisting of two or more consonants linked together. I do not entirely dissent from the opinion expressed by Prof. Westergaard¹, that among these compound consonants are also found some arbitrary characters; but I believe that their origin may be regarded as on the whole regular and natural. It was a current style, which, though hastily written, was not disagreeable to the eye; and to the natives, who understood the language, its difficulties may not have been so hard to surmount as they appear to us.²

According to our view, M. Levy is on the right path when he traces the so-called Zend alphabet, that in which the Avesta is written in our oldest MSS., to the Southern Irānian writing (Eastern Pahlavi).³ Several of the characters of both these alphabets are quite similar; but there is a number of signs peculiar to the Avesta alphabet, *viz.*,

¹ *Zendavesta*, vol. I. p. 20.

² The variety of writing which we have here designated as Southern Irānian, is also called *Uzvarsh* or *Huzvāresh*. A much quoted passage of a Parsi book (*Cf.* my *Huzv. gramm.* page 22) expressly names *Uzvarsh* as an alphabet, and, indeed, as the writing of Sevād. This statement can easily be reconciled with the arguments adduced above.

³ *Cf.* his *Beiträge*, p. 460. A different view, however, is held by Lepsius, who, in the second edition of his *Standard-alphabets*, p. 120, is inclined to regard the Avesta alphabet as older, from which, he supposes, the ordinary Pahlavi alphabet was first reduced in the time of the Sassanidae.

those of the aspirates, which cannot easily be proved to have been developed from the Southern Irānian writing. The distinctive feature of the Avesta alphabet is in the vowel-signs. It not only comprises the *matres lectionis*, (*i.e.*, the vowel-signs for *a*, *i*, *u*); but all the vowels, even the shortest ones, are represented in it and set down in the same line with the consonants, just as is the case in our European alphabets. This peculiarity distinguishes the Avesta alphabet from all the other alphabets of Irān and of Asia in general. For, not only is this characteristic absent in the Old Parthian and Sassānian systems, but, likewise, in the cuneiform as well as Arian characters, since the former only represents the *matres lectionis*, whilst the latter does not place the vowels on the same footing with the consonants, but merges them in the consonants themselves. A single Asiatic alphabet, the Armenian alone, possesses such characteristics. According to our conviction the Avesta alphabet does not seem to be older than the Armenian; perhaps, to a certain extent, it may be contemporaneous with it. . . .

In systematizing the Avesta alphabet the object which the people endeavoured to obtain could only have been to enable the reader to peruse the Sacred Texts as accurately as was necessary. It is probable that it was specially intended for particular individuals who had to read the Sacred Books to the people and who might be liable to commit slight errors in haste owing to the defects of the writing in use; but it is less probable that the object in view was to help the general reader by means of a clear or lucid alphabet. I believe, therefore, that the inventor of the Avesta characters chiefly studied the requirements of the public readers of the Irānian Scriptures, for much, in fact, depended on accuracy in reading them aloud (Comp. *Yasna*, XIX. 6). We should, however, err, if we assumed that such was the exclusive object of the Avesta alphabet; nothing indicates that it

was ever regarded as sacred. Firstly, we find that the majority of the Parsis do not strictly believe that the Avesta was originally written in the Avesta characters that we now possess; in fact, they have sometimes employed the modern Persian alphabet, and in modern times all the fragments of the Avesta, but most frequently the Khorda-Avesta, have been printed in Gujarati. Secondly, the Avesta-writing has not seldom been found also in Pahlavi works in the rendering of certain isolated words, mostly such as could not be made out by any other means. Just in the same manner do we find the Avesta characters frequently used in Pahlavi glossaries to show the pronunciation of certain Pahlavi expressions. Thirdly and finally, we may add that the Avesta alphabet probably contains more signs than are required to exhibit the Avesta Text. The writing in the oldest MSS. of the Avesta, as well as in the later Indian MSS. copied from them, differs somewhat from the characters used in the MSS. that were transcribed in Yezd and Kermān.¹ This difference is, however, unimportant, and, except in minor points, is perhaps due to a taste for elegant penmanship.

So far we have traced the history of Irānian writing from the earliest times to the more recent period, by the help of coins, inscriptions, and written works that are still in existence. Moreover, there are some notices upon Old Irānian alphabets by some Mohammedan scholars, who have written on the antiquities of Irān. Amongst these writers the learned author of the *Fihrist* occupies a pre-eminent position. The majority of these notices refer evidently to the modern Sassānian period and furnish no incomplete survey of the alphabets then current. It must not be supposed that the various specimens of writing, which they describe,

¹ These will be found in my *Altbaktrischen Grammatik*, pp. 7-8. The slight difference in them seems also to contravene the theory that our oldest MSS. came from Yezd.

represent quite as many systems; several of them may be supposed to be distinct merely in the apparent shape of the characters, just in the same manner as in the later styles Taaliq and Shikest may be distinguished. Nevertheless, we ought to assume a variety of systems in a few cases, where a great difference exists in the number of letters. It is certainly not accidental that the author of the *Fihrist* fixes upon seven as the number of alphabets; the Parsis also believe that Tahmurath was gifted with the knowledge of seven descriptions of writing,¹ which was after him transferred to Yima. Elsewhere, too, the number seven is regarded as the most sacred amongst the Irānians.—First of all is to be mentioned the alphabet of Māni, which is probably one of the oldest in the series of alphabets named in *Fihrist*. Since there are several evidences to prove that Māni systematized a particular alphabet, this fact must be considered as beyond all doubt. It is probable that Māni did not wish that his books should be accessible to unqualified readers, and consequently wrote them in an alphabet which was only known to his disciples. This alphabet must have been distinguished from other Irānian alphabets more by the shape of the characters than by its intrinsic nature. As to the number of letters, our authorities are, however, disagreed. While Epiphanes affirms that the alphabet of Māni contained 22 symbols,² after the manner of the Syriac alphabet, the author of the *Fihrist* asserts that it was made up of a larger number of characters than the Arabic alphabet, i.e., of more than 28 signs. One single specimen of that writing would be sufficient to remove all doubts.—A second important alphabet is that which is called by the author of the *Fihrist*, the *Din-defterih* (دين دفتریه), which, as its name also denotes, served for writing the Avesta.

¹ Cf. my *Parsi-grammatik*, p. 139.

² Epiphanes, *Adv. Haeres.* II. p. 629, ed. Patav.

Masūdi, who tells us somewhat more on the subject, mentions that this alphabet had 60 letters and was not employed exclusively for the Avesta.¹ It might be regarded to a certain extent as identical with our Avesta alphabet, which exhibits only 48 different signs, granting the assumption that several characters, which were originally in existence, are now no longer distinguished in our Texts.² Or we may attach some credit to Masūdi's opinion that this alphabet not only served for transcribing the Avesta; but that the remaining 12 letters were employed in writing other works, which were beyond the pale of the Avesta literature.—A third species of writing, which the author of the *Fihrist* names *Kashtaj* (کشته), is believed to have been composed of 28 signs and adapted to seals and coins. It was, perhaps, almost identical with the earlier writing of the Sassanidae, which contains only 24 signs including the ordinary compounds,³ and of which it is quite possible that some of the characters may still be unknown to us.—The fourth species is styled *Half-Kashtaj* (نیم کشته) in the *Fihrist*, and was employed in works on medicine and philosophy. This alphabet differs but slightly from the third. Here the number of signs is the same; probably the difference was due only to the materials used in writing books.—Much more unlike the third is the fifth kind of writing, which the *Fihrist* designates *Vesh-debirīh* (ویش د بیریه), i.e., "much-writing," since it contained no less than 365 signs, in which, the author says, the mysteries of physiognomy were written. As it was a cryptography we must of course believe in the existence of a great multitude of

¹ Cf. Lepsius, *Das ursprüngliche Zendalphabet* (Berlin, 1863), p. 338. Masūdi, II. p. 124. The *Fihrist*, I. 13th ed. Flügel.

² This view of Lepsius is, no doubt, supported by the Parsi traditional writings.

³ Cf. Mordtmann, *Zd̄dmG.* vol. VIII. tablet 5.

characters, even if we do not regard the number 365 as authentic. What the shape of these letters was we should like to know; however, the brevity of the author's statement does not admit of any conclusion. It is possible that the author of the *Fihrist* meant such contractions as are to be found in the Huzvaresh writing described above; but it is also possible that the style of writing in syllables, akin to the more complicated species of cuneal letters, survived from the earliest times to the period of the Sassanidae.—A far simpler alphabet is the sixth *Rāz-sahrih* (?) (رَازْ سَهْرِيَه), i.e., cryptography. It was a twofold species comprising 25 as well as 40 signs, about which we can say very little in particular, because in all probability Ibn Muqaffa himself never saw it. The same may be said regarding the style of writing which he calls *Shāh-debirīh* (شَاهْ دَبِيرِيَه), or "royal writing," and which must have been very much like the foregoing.—Finally, the seventh and last species bears the appellation of *Nāmeh-debirīh* (نَامَهْ دَبِيرِيَه), i.e., the "writting of letters or books." Besides, it is also stated that some books were written in the old Syriac language and read in Persian. This is somewhat analogous to what the same author says regarding *Zevāreshn*. Nevertheless, this alphabet is said to have been formed of only 33 simple characters without any contractions whatever.

SASANIAN INSCRIPTION OF NAQSH-I RUSTAM.*

Of all the Sasanian rock-inscriptions known to exist in Persia the longest are those attached, respectively, to the two groups of sculpture which are now called Naqsh-i Rajab and Naqsh-i Rustam. The former inscription consists of thirty one lines containing originally about 1,400 letters, and the latter appears to have formerly comprised about seventy-seven lines and nearly 7,000 letters.

The late Professor Westergaard, when sending me a tracing of his copy of the remains of the Naqsh-i Rustam inscription, in March 1878, remarked that he had "unfortunately missed the Naqsh-i Rajab inscription when visiting Presepolis" in 1843, but had "tried to make copy of the large Naqsh-i Rustam inscription, as exact as its mutilated state would allow." That Westergaard did not see the Naqsh-i Rajab inscription must still remain a source of regret to Pahlavi scholars, as there can be no doubt that the whole of that inscription would have been deciphered long ago if a copy of it had been taken and published by Westergaard with his usual care and accuracy. As it is, we have to depend upon the copy taken by the French expedition under M. Flandin,¹ which is more of an artist's sketch than a rigorously accurate transcript, and, therefore, makes the greater part of the inscription unintelligible, although it is evident that not more than one in forty of its letters is really illegible.

The state of the Naqsh-i Rustam inscription is very different; for, although some of the latter words in each of its first thirty-six lines are so distinctly legible as to be accurately given in the copy taken by the French expedition,² yet only scattered words and letters can be read over the remaining surface. The mutilated condition of this inscription can be readily seen from the reduced

* By Dr. E. W. West. *Vide "Indian Antiquary."*

¹ See Flandin's *Voyage en Perse*, vol. IV., pl. 190.

² *Ibid.*, vol. IV., pl. 181.

facsimile¹ of Westergaard's copy, which accompanies this paper; and at first sight there seems little chance of obtaining any connected meaning from these scattered fragments. Further investigation, however, shows that the names and titles of the kings, when restored, fill up several of the blank spaces; also, that two or three phrases, which frequently occur and can be readily recovered, fill up several more; while some missing words can be supplied by guesses, more or less hazardous, so as to obtain a connected meaning for more than one-third of the inscription. Such guesses are, however, only justifiable when there is little hope of obtaining a better copy, and when they are so carefully indicated as not to mislead the reader by assuming any greater certainty than really exists.

The following transliteration of as much of the first thirty-four lines as seems recoverable has been prepared by these means; and it may be noted, as a proof of Westergaard's accuracy, that hardly one in a hundred of his letters seems to require emendation, although some of the Sasanian characters can be easily mistaken for others. In this transliteration all the words and letters supplied by guess are printed in italics, and all vowels expressed by Sasanian characters (except initial *a*) are circumflexed; the rest of the vowels being merely understood in the original. Where the number of letters apparently missing (including spaces between words) is not expressly mentioned, it is indicated by a hyphen for one letter, a dot for two, or a dash for five letters and spaces omitted, or by any combination of such dashes, dots, and hyphens as may be necessary for indicating the probable number of missing letters and spaces. The beginning of each line of the inscription is indicated by its number in parentheses; the letters *h* and *kh*, or *p* and *f*, represent the same Sasanian character; the letter *r* is often written like *l* in Sasanian, and the syllable *-man* represents a single letter which appears to be usually equivalent to a Semitic final *n*, but is written *-man* in Pahlavi MSS.

¹ Photographed from the original copy made by Westergaard on 24th and 25th April 1843, for the use of which I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Fausböll and the courtesy of the chief librarian of the University Library at Copenhagen, to which the literary papers of the late Professor Westergaard have been presented.

*Transliteration of the first part of the Naqsh-i Rustam
Inscription.*

- (1) Amatam kartir¹ zî magôpat va aéharpat val Artakhshatar malkân malkâ Aîrân va Shahpûhari malkân malkâ zî hûrastâi² va hûkâmakî havîtun
- (2) afam áfrînakân va sipâsî dîm — . — va Artakhshatar Aîrân malkân malkâ va Shahpûhari malkân malkâ kartî havîtun zakam vabîdûn
- (3) zî Shahpûhari malkân malkâ pavan Aîrân va Anîrân kartî pavan³ babâ val babâ shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk hâmishatarî pavan Magôstan kâmkarî
- (4) va pavan dûshârmaki farmân zi Artakhshatar malkân malkâ pavan shatarî zî Aîrân malkân malkâ . shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk kabîr kartakân zî
- (5) yazdân⁴ afzâdihi va kabîr âtûrî va Aîrân yetibûnd . — barâ₅ avlayâ aéharpat va magôpat va kabîr âtûrân âtûrî . — . pâtakhshatarî hatîmûn va Aûharmazdî va yazdân
- (6) babâ sûtî yehevûn — — v-â-rabâ-v-v — ûnt va zenman — . — nâ . m — . — pavan shatarî Shahpûhari malkân malkâ pavan vâspôhara kan pakdûn vabîdûn
- (7) va yetibûnî a — — î — - chîgûn . — âî Aûharmazdî va yazdân val kâmaki . — vazîr va — va zatî pâtakhshatar va mâtzdân maman valman
- (8) vidanâ madam Shahpûhari malkân malkâ pavan babâ val bubâ shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk kartî . valman pavan hanâ avagun⁶ madam nipishî yekavîmûnt aîk vartîr zî aéharpat
- (9) va magôpat Shahpûhari malkân malkâ val bagdât gâsi. vazlûnt va Aûharmazdî malkân malkâ aîti barman pavan shatarî . yekavîmûnt⁷ afam Aûharmazdî malkân malkâ kûrâpi
- (10) madam yetibûnî afam gadman va pâtakhshatarî zabîdûnî afam⁸ babâ val babâ shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk hâmshatarî¹⁰ pavan malkân zî yazdân hamgûnakî kâmkarîtarî.

¹ Compare the Naqsh-i Rajab inscription. The word is *vartîr* in line 8.

² For *hûrastakî* apparently.

³ See line 8.

⁴ See lines 17 and 31.

⁵ See line 32.

⁶ See line 13.

⁷ See lines 14 and 20.

⁸ See line 15.

⁹ See line 16.

¹⁰ See lines 3 and 23.

(11) afam¹ Shahpûhari aêharpat shem va magôpat shem kartî Aûharmazdî magôpat shem va aêharpat kartî d-d.. p. k — . shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk kabîr

(12) kartakân zî yazdân afzâdihi va kabîr âtûri va gehân² yetibûnd . — - barâ avlayâ aêharpat va magôpat — — va kabîr âtûrân âtûri pâtakhshatari.

(13) hatîmûnd va zati³ pâtakhshatari va mâtzadân maman valman vidanâ madam Aûharmazdî malkân malkâ pavan babâ val babâ shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk kartî . valman pavan hanâ a ragûn

(14) madam nipishî yekavîmûnt aîk variîr . — zî magôpat va aêharpat Aûharmazdî malkân malkâ val bagdât gâsî vazlûnt va Varahrân malkân

(15) malkâ hand Shahpûhari — — — Aûharmazdi malkân malkâ pavan hamshatardarî yekavîmûnt . afam Varahrân malkân malkâ zak hamgûnakî⁴ pavan

(16) gadman yetibûni va pâtakhshatari vabidûni afam babâ val babâ va shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk hamkartakârân zî yazdân hamgûnakî kâmkârî

(17) afam Aûharmazdi magôpat shem Varahrân shem kartî⁵ . hamâki shatarî⁶ val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk kabîr kartakân zî yazdân afzâdihi va kabîr âtûri

(18) va gehân yetibûud — . — - barâ avlayâ aêharpat va magôpat — va kabîr âtûrân âtûri pâtakhshatari hatîmûnd . va zati

(19) pâtakhshatari va mâtzadân maman valman vidanâ madam Varahrân malkân malkâ kartî va valman pavan hanâ madam nipishî

(20) yekavîmûnt aîk variîr zî aêharpat va magôpat Varahrân malkân malkâ val bagdât gâsî

(21) vazlûnt [60 letters] kartaki⁷ pavan . .

(22) [60 letters] i gâ — tah-yetibûni⁸

(23) afam gadman va pâtakhshatari vabidûni afam babâ val babâ shatarî val shatarî zîvâk val zîvâk hamshatari pavan

¹ This sentence is very doubtful.

² See line 32.

³ See lines 7, 18, and 32.

⁴ So in Flandin's copy.

⁵ A very doubtful sentence; compare lines 11 and 24.

⁶ See lines 11-14.

⁷ In Flandin's copy it is kar - - i.

⁸ See lines 10 and 11.

- (24) *malkān zī yazdān hamgūnakī kāmkārītārī va būkht rūbān Varahrān¹ aeharpat shem va magōpatam Varahrān shem magōpat*
- (25) *va aeharpat karlī* [48 letters] t v . - hanā vabidūnt
- (26) [53 letters] *shatārī val shatārī zīvāk val*
- (27) *zīvāk* [51 letters] ân va magōi gabrā bēn shatārī
- (28) [27 letters] *mayā va âtūrī* [24 letters] ihī madam yehamtūn
- (29) [28 letters] *babā* [29 letters] shikān min — sheditun
- (30) [32 letters] *asl* [27 letters] t-i — yehevūnd va aūzdēsī gūnākīhī
- (31) — — — vpūhī² — — va nished — — . *shatārī³ val shatārī zīvāk val zīvāk kabīr kartakān zī yazdān afzādīhī*
- (32) *va kabīr âtūrī va gehān yetibūnd* — — barā avlayā aeharpat *va magōpat* — *va kabīr âtūrān âtūrī pātakhshatari hatimūnt*. va satī pātakhshatari
- (33) *maman valman vidanā* madam *Varahrān malkān malkā* *va Varahrān* [30 letters] kar — būkht rūbān *Varahrān aēharpat* *va magōpat*
- (34) [20 letters] ūnī p — — ūh [28 letters] m — . — - t kabīr âtūrān vamduñi bēn shatārī.

Translation of the above⁴.

(1) *When my crown of mobad and herbad⁵ existed for Artakhshatar, king of the kings of Irān, and Shapūharī, king of kings who was well-principled and well-inclined*

(2) *and . . .⁶ my benedictions and praise which . . .⁷ me), and had made Artakhshatar a king of the kings of Irān, and Shapūharī a king of the kings, that was done by me*

¹ See line 33, but the sentence is very doubtful; compare lines 11 and 17.

² Possibly *Shapūharī*.

³ See lines 11-13.

⁴ Italics indicate words and portions of words which are either supplied by guess where the inscription is illegible, or are added to complete the sense. The commencement of each line in the original inscription is approximately indicated by its number in parentheses, and the extent of the missing text is only approximately shown by the number of dots.

⁵ A Mabad is a Parsi priest whose special duty is to conduct religious ceremonies, and herbad is a general term applied to all ranks of the priesthood.

⁶ Perhaps "celebrated."

⁷ Perhaps "propitiated or pleased."

(3) which *Shahpûhari*, king of kings, did in *Irân* and *non-Irân* through capital to capital, town to town, and place to place of the united country, spontaneously in Magôstan

(4) and by the loving command of *Artakhshatar*, king of kings, in the country of the king of kings of *Irân*. From town to town and place to place the great deeds which

(5) are the bounty of the angels and settle in the great fire and *Irân*.¹ but the . . . of the first herbad and mobad, and of the great fire of fires, ended the sovereign; and *Aûharmazdî* and the angels

(6) became the benefit of the capital . . . great . . . and this . . . in the country *Shahpûhari*, king of kings, inflicted chastisement on the nobles

(7) and sat . . . as . . *Aûharmazdî* and the angels, at will . . . And smitten was the sovereign and the slain, for that

(8) time it was done unto *Shahpûhari*, king of kings, through capital to capital, town to town, and place to place. In this fashion it is written about, that the crown of the herbad

(9) and mobad *Shahpûhari*, king of kings, goes to the divinely-appointed place, and *Aûharmazdî*, king of kings, who is the son, remains in the country. And *Aûharmazdî*, king of kings, sat on my kûrâpî (or kûlâpî)

(10) and was made my glory and sovereign; and from capital to capital, town to town, and place to place, of my united country, he was more absolute among the kings who were similar to angels.²

(11) And *Shahpûhari*'s title of herbad and title of mabod appointed by me, was made *Aûharmazdî*'s title of mobad and herbad.³ . . . From town to town, and place to place, the great

(12) deeds which are the bounty of the angels and settle in the great fire and the world . . . but the . . . of the first herbad and mobad, and the great fire of fires, end the sovereign.

(13) And smitten was the sovereign and the slain, for that

¹ Perhaps "he performed" both here and in the similar phases in lines 12, 18, and 32.

² That is, being inferior to him who was their supreme lord.

³ This sentence and the corresponding passages in lines 17 and 24 are the most doubtful parts of this decipherment.

time it was done unto Aûharmazdî, king of kings, through capital to capital, town to town, and place to place. In this fashion it is

(14) written about, that the crown . . . of the mobad and herbad Aûharmazdî, king of kings, goes to the divinely-appointed place, and Varahrân,

(15) king of kings, this . . . of *Shahpûhari*, remains as coadjutor of Aûharmazdî, king of kings. And Varahrân, king of kings, in like manner,

(16) sat in glory and was made sovereign by me; and from capital to capital, and town to town, and place to place he was absolute, through me, over fellow-performers of exploits who were similar to angels;

(17) and Aûharmazdî's title of mobad was made the title of Varahrân by me. From every town to town, and place to place, the great deeds which are the bounty of the angels and settle in the great fire

(18) and the world . . . , but the . . . of the first herbad and mobad and the great fire of fires end the sovereign. And smitten.

(19) was the sovereign and the slain, for that time it was done unto Varahrân, king of kings; and in this way it is written about,

(20) that the crown of the herbad and mobad Varahrân, king of kings, goes to the divinely-appointed place,

(21) a deed in . .

(22) sat,

(23) and was made my glory and sovereign; and from capital to capital, town to town, and place to place of my united country, among

(24) the kings who were similar to angels, he was more absolute; and the title of herbad and mobad of Varahrân with the saved soul¹ was made by me Varahrân's title of mobad

(25) and herbad this he does

(26) from town to town and place to

(27) place and the Magian men in the country

(28) . . . water and fire . . . came on

(29) . . . capital . . . cast the . . from . .

¹ Equivalent to "the deceased Varahrân."

(30) become, and the habitude¹ of the idol-temple
 (31) . . . and sits (?) . . From town to town, and place to place,
 the great deeds which are the bounty of the angels

(32) and settle in the great fire and the world . . , but the . .
 of the first herbad and mobad and of the great fire of fires, ends the
 sovereign. And smitten was the sovereign,

(33) for that is the time unto Varahrān, king of kings, and
 Varahrān , Varahrān with the saved soul, the herbad and
 mobad,

(34) the great fires arose² in the country.

In the subsequent lines of the inscription, owing to its mutilated
 condition, only a few words and phrases are intelligible.

(35) Va zatakān 'and the smitten' ;

(36) Shahpūhari malkān malkā, 'Shahpūhari, king of kings' ;
 shatarī ātūri, 'the fire of the country' ;

(37) malkān malkā, 'king of kings' ;

(38) shatarī maman, 'the country, for' ;

(39) vabidūn vad, 'dīd, until' ; val, 'to' ; babā Shahpūhari
 malkān

(40) malkā, 'the capital of Shahpūhari, king of kings' ;
 mekhītun afam, 'struck, and by me' ; Aūharmazdī malkān malkā
 minō, 'Aūharmazdī, king of kings, the spirit' ;

(41) kartī yehevūn, zak ham barā yansebūn, 'was done, that
 same took away' ;

(42) rādī, 'liberal' ;

(43) mekhītun, afam, 'struck, and by me' ;

(44) kabīr, 'great' ;

(45) afash, 'and by him' ;

(46) vakhdūn, va kabīr, 'took, and great' ; yazdān va kabīr ātūri
 kāmkārtārī yehevūn, 'he was more absolute than the angels and the
 great fire'

If the first portion of this inscription has been correctly restored
 it would appear to contain merely an account of the succession of
 the first six Sasanian monarchs (A.D. 226--283), from

¹ Compare Pers. *gūnāh*. It cannot be "sinfulness," because that is
vināsīh in Pahlavi; the change to *gūnāhī* being modern.

² The verb *vāmdūnī* is unknown in the MSS., but is a regular forma-
 tion from the Semitic root *תָּמַד*.

Artakhshatar I. to Varahrān III., with some general allusion to their chief actions. Whether this succession is continued beyond Varahrān III. is very doubtful, for though some kings are afterwards mentioned, such as Shahpūharī in lines 36 and 39, Aūharmazdī in line 40, and a king whose name is missing in line 37, yet these names can hardly refer to Aūharmazdī II. and his successor, Shahpūharī II., because the latter name is mentioned first. But they are, most probably, the names of the second and third Sasanian monarchs, already mentioned in the earlier part of the inscription; so that the latter half of the inscription probably gave a more detailed account of the deeds of the kings mentioned in the former half. As, however, the very short reign of Varahrān III. is hardly likely to have been commemorated by so long an inscription, it is perhaps most reasonable to suppose that the accession of his successor, Narsīhī (A.D. 283—300), may have been mentioned in the missing portion of line 35 or 36, and the actual date of the inscription was about A.D. 290.

Owing to its mutilated state this inscription is of little value as a historical document. Like that of Naqsh-i Rajab it is written in the first person, and professes apparently to be dictated by the divine Aūharmazd himself; this is clear enough in the first half of the inscription, and the occurrence of the word *afam*, 'and by me,' in lines 40, 43, and 47, shows that the use of the first person continued in the latter half.

The chief value of the inscription is philological. Even in its present mutilated state it supplies one hundred distinct Sasanian words, of which forty-five have not been found in other inscriptions, though all but fourteen are known to exist in Pahlavi MSS. Allowing for certain peculiarities in orthography, and for the existence of about one strange word in seven, its language is practically the same as that of the MSS. still preserved by the Pârsîs.

OPINIONS.

(“*The Academy*,” June 19, 1886.)

“Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times.” By Dr. W. GEIGER. Translated from the German by DÁRAB DASTUR PESHOTAN SANJANA, B.A., Vol. I., London: HENRY FROWDE, 1885.

A German scientific work translated into English by a Parsi priest is a novelty in literature; and when to this are added the facts that the original work is the best and most complete that has been written upon the subjects of which it treats, and that the translation is as good and idiomatic as could be expected from an Englishman, it may be safely recommended as a book well worth perusal by any one who wishes to learn all that can be really ascertained, from the *Avesta* texts, about the manners and customs of the ancient Zoroastrians. The translator, who is a son of the high priest of the predominant section of the Parsis in Bombay, has selected for translation such portions of the original German work as he considered most likely to interest his fellow-countrymen and English readers in general. He has therefore confined his attention, in the present volume, to §§ 23-43 (omitting considerable portion of §§ 28 and 39) of Dr. Geiger's book. These sections, which form nearly half of the German work, treat of the *Avesta* people and their adversaries, the manners and customs of the former, their ideas as to a future existence, the configuration of the world, and divisions of time, their domestic animals, agriculture, manufactures, medical treatment, habitations, and settlements. In addition to these a short but comprehensive essay on the religion of the *Avesta*, its sacred beings and demonology, has been contributed by Dr. Geiger as an introduction to the English translation, and forms by no means the least interesting part of the work.—E. W. WEST, Ph. D.

To

DASTUR DÁRAB PESHOTAN SANJANA,

MY DEAR SIR,

I have received by the kind intermediary of your distinguished father the very handsome Volume I. of your translation of Geiger's *Ostirānische Kultur*; for which I beg sincerely to thank you. Geiger's work has long been very familiar and useful to me, and I believe it was an excellent idea to give to English readers the most interesting parts of it in a translation. I have already read over the greater part of your version, and find it remarkably well done. That a Parsi priest should succeed so

well in rendering a German scientific work into idiomatic English, is truly a most creditable fact for the Mazdean Community of Bombay. I read with particular interest your own notes and additions, most of which are deserving of very careful consideration from European *savants*. I hope soon to see the continuation of your very important work, besides many other original productions which will be of value for the promotion of Avestic and Pehlevi studies in India and in England. Meanwhile let me sincerely congratulate you on what you have already so brilliantly achieved.

Believe me to be,

Yours very sincerely,

L. C. CASASTELLI, M.A.,

(Professor of History, St. Bede's College.)

14th January 1886.

WÜRZBURG (BAVARIA),

August 18th, 1885.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have to thank you very much for the copy of your English translation of Geiger's work, Vol. I. Your valuable present has only reached me a few days ago. I value the original very highly, and I have no doubt that the additions which your learning has enabled you to make, have enhanced its value considerably.

Please remember me kindly to your worthy father.

Yours truly,

J. JOLLY, Ph.D.,

(Professor of Comparative Philology in the University
of Würzburg, Germany.)

OXFORD,

August 9th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,

Allow me to thank you most cordially for your very useful and important translation of Dr. Geiger's work on the Civilization of the Eastern Iranians.

I dare say you are aware that I wrote an article on Zoroasterianism in the 'Nineteenth Century' some time ago. This will form the basis of an essay on the same subject, which will constitute a chapter or two of the Second Part of my work called 'Religious Thought and Hope in India,' to be published by John Murray, London. I hope to notice your work in that essay and perhaps to quote from it.

Faithfully yours,

MONIER WILLIAMS, D.C.L., LL. D.,
(Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford.)

ELPHINSTONE COLLEGE,

August 25.

My DEAR SIR,

I should have thanked you before now for the very handsome and interesting volume, the fruits of your meritorious industry, which you were kind enough to send me last week. * * * * * A full exhibition of the details and most characteristic developments of any one of the religious systems which have helped to form the character and shape the destinies of men possesses an abiding interest which is felt even by those who do not exactly regard the revival or purification of the existing historical religious as an indispensable condition of future progress. But undoubtedly whatever makes these religious more rational, and therefore more truly spiritual, is matter for congratulation. This, I think, your labours will help to effect, and I greatly hope they may be appreciated by your countrymen.

Believe me, very sincerely yours,

W. WORDSWORTH, B. A.,
(Principal, Elphinstone College.)

To

NASSERWANJI BYRAMJI, Esq.,
Secretary to the SIR JAMSHETJI J. Zartoshti Madressa.

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you, that according to your request, I examined Mr. Darab Dastur Peshutan Sanjana in the German language. The book which he had read for this purpose was "Goethe's *Wanderjahr*." Goethe, as you are well aware of, is one of the most difficult of the German classical writers. But in spite of the difficulties presenting themselves to a beginner, Mr. Sanjana translated several passages with great

skill and knowledge into idiomatic English. I then tried him in other passages out of the works of the same author, *Prose* as well as *Poetry*, and to my astonishment he distinguished himself also there. After a short time of meditation about the passage proposed he gave a true and ~~sound~~ translation.

Mr. Sanjana is certainly to be congratulated upon the remark he made in the course of three years by his great diligence natural talent for languages.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

E. USTERI, S. J.,

(Professor of Greek and Latin,

St. Xavier's College.)